





BR 145 .S65 1894 v.5
Sheldon, Henry C. 1845-1928
History of the Christian
church





HISTORY
OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BY
HENRY C. SHELDON,
AUTHOR OF "HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE," AND PROFESSOR
IN BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

VOL. V.
THE MODERN CHURCH.
Part Third.

NEW YORK: 46 EAST 14TH STREET.
THOMAS Y. CROWELL & CO.
BOSTON: 100 PURCHASE STREET.
1894.

Copyright, 1894,
BY HENRY C. SHELDON

University Press:
JOHN WILSON AND SON, CAMBRIDGE, U. S. A.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PROTESTANTISM IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE SINCE SCHLEIERMACHER AND THE UNION.

	PAGE
I. MAIN PHASES OF THE POLITICAL MOVEMENT IN GERMANY	1
II. THE CHURCH IN GERMANY VIEWED PRINCIPALLY IN ITS RELATION TO THE STATE	6
III. PROMINENT DEVELOPMENTS IN GERMAN THEOLOGY	18
IV. OUTLINES OF PROTESTANT HISTORY IN VARIOUS PORTIONS OF THE CONTINENT	35

CHAPTER II.

ROMANISM IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE SINCE THE FALL OF THE FIRST NAPOLEON.

I. MEDIEVAL TENDENCIES IN THE SPHERE OF WOR- SHIP	44
II. PAPAL ABSOLUTISM AND INFALLIBILITY	64
III. ECCLESIASTICO-POLITICAL MATTERS	103

CHAPTER III.

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND IN THE NINETEENTH
CENTURY.

	PAGE
I. GENERAL SURVEY OF THE RELIGIOUS FIELD IN ENGLAND	132
II. TRACTARIANISM, OR RITUALISM	136
III. THE BROAD CHURCH	164
IV. SOME FACTS RESPECTING ENGLISH DISSENTERS .	179
V. CHURCH POLITY AND RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN SCOTLAND	190
VI. IRELAND	201
VII. PHASES OF SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY IN BRITAIN	207

CHAPTER IV.

AMERICA SINCE THE COLONIAL ERA.

I. THE EXPERIMENT OF A FREE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES	222
II. DENOMINATIONAL MOVEMENTS AND CRISES IN THE UNITED STATES	247
1. UNITARIANS AND UNIVERSALISTS	247
2. CONGREGATIONALISTS	260
3. PRESBYTERIANS AND REFORMED	270
4. METHODISTS	280
5. BAPTISTS AND DISCIPLES	291
6. EPISCOPALIANS	296
7. LUTHERANS	302
8. QUAKERS	308
9. ROMAN CATHOLICS	309

CONTENTS.

v

	PAGE
10. MORMONS	331
11. SOCIALISTIC COMMUNITIES	339
12. DENOMINATIONAL STATISTICS	341
III. OUTLINES OF CANADIAN CHURCH HISTORY	343
IV. PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENTS IN SPANISH AMERICA AND BRAZIL	356

CHAPTER V.

THE EASTERN CHURCH	374
------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VI.

A GLANCE AT PROTESTANT MISSIONS	383
---	-----

CONCLUSION	411
----------------------	-----

APPENDIX.

I. THE BULL UNIGENITUS ON THE READING OF THE SCRIPTURES	417
II. POPES AND EMPERORS	419

INDEX	421
-----------------	-----

THE MODERN CHURCH.

Part Thirv.

CHAPTER I.

PROTESTANTISM IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE SINCE SCHLEIERMACHER AND THE UNION.

I.—MAIN PHASES OF THE POLITICAL MOVEMENT IN GERMANY.

ADVANCE toward the constitutional type of government and the establishment of the Empire under the headship of Prussia may be designated as the two great developments within the sphere of German politics since the overthrow of the first Napoleon. The continued pressure of popular demand brought about the former development; in effecting the latter the management of statesmen and the shock of armies were the chief instrumentalities.

The leading governments were loath to admit any restrictions upon monarchical authority. Promises of constitutional rule which had been made during the struggle against the Napoleonic despotism, and which had been formally sanctioned at Vienna in 1815 as a part of the scheme of the New German Confederacy, were coolly discarded. Some of the smaller States, it is true, gave the

people a measure of representation in the government. But this was done in the face of a jealous watchfulness on the part of the great powers. Metternich, the influential Austrian minister, conceived that the repression of liberal tendencies was the foremost dictate of statecraft. The Prussian monarch needed no special urging to constrain him to embrace a similar view. Thus, while the schools and universities were sending forth a large number of highly educated young men, direct access to public affairs appeared to be almost wholly closed against them. The result was a widespread discontent. This may have remained largely beneath the surface ; it was present, nevertheless, and ready to use its opportunity. The excitement caused by the overthrow of Louis Philippe and the proclamation of a republic in France, in the early part of the year 1848, gave the needed opportunity. A revolutionary wave swept over Germany, sparing indeed thrones, but exacting such concessions from monarchs as involved a close approach to republican constitutions. This was the case in Prussia, as well as in the minor States. But the enthusiasm of the crisis had struck a higher level than could be maintained. The nobility, whom the new scheme proposed to set aside, bestirred themselves. A counter-movement was started ; and since the army, together with a large part of the country people, had little interest in the revolutionary undertaking, its partisans were soon reduced to comparative impotence. Still a gain had been made for the cause of constitutional government. The Prussian King, Frederic William IV., forthwith published a constitution providing for two assemblies of representatives, and conceding general suffrage, though with such regu-

lations as gave a superior weight to property-holders. From that time autocratic government in Christian Europe had a precarious tenure outside of Russia. Though Austria in 1851 cancelled the constitution which the stress of revolution had elicited three years before, it was deemed prudent in 1861 to gratify the public with an equivalent instrument.

During the agitations of 1848–49 the idea of German unity received more or less emphasis in connection with that of popular rights. There was a widespread feeling that the existing Confederation was a poor makeshift, and not a few had the boldness to speak distinctly in favor of reconstituting the Empire, with the headship vested in the Hohenzollern or Prussian dynasty. Frederic William IV., however, considered that it would involve too great a peril to enter upon such an enterprise without the co-operation or consent of the leading sovereigns.

Among those who discountenanced at this time the imperial scheme was a stanch upholder of Prussian royalty, whose courage and activity in stemming the democratic uprising were especially conspicuous. Apprehensive that union with a group of smaller States would rather detract from the distinctive position of Prussia than add to her lustre, Bismarck opposed the project for making an Emperor of his King, and spoke for the maintenance of a good understanding with Austria. But it was not long before a closer connection with the affairs of the Confederation greatly changed his views. Dislike of Austrian ascendancy and the ambition to gain a decisive headship for Prussia among the German States became ruling motives with him. In 1859 he wrote:

"I see in our relation to the Confederacy a weakness of Prussia which sooner or later we must heal with fire and sword." When, in 1862, he took his place as Chancellor of the realm, under King William I., there was doubtless very little mist before his eyes as to the policy which he meant to pursue for the glory of Prussia and the strength of Germany.

The way to the goal lay through a brief and decisive conflict with each of the great rival powers, Austria and France. In either instance the immediate cause of conflict was comparatively trivial, and would not have stood in the way of peace had there not been back of it the much more potent cause of national jealousies and rival ambitions. Bismarck was not anxious for peace, at least in the former instance, though he had a prudent regard for the advantage which would accrue to Prussia from the ability to cast the odium of beginning war upon her antagonists. Hence the entanglements which grew out of the joint occupation of Schleswig and Holstein by Prussia and Austria were allowed in 1866 to issue in a rupture. The result of the conflict was a long step toward the new German Empire. Austria, in consequence of her defeat on the battle-field of Sadowa, consented to the dissolution of the existing Confederacy, and left Prussia free to exercise her pleasure with the smaller German States. Hannover, Hesse, Nassau, and Frankfurt were annexed without delay, and definitive possession was also taken of Schleswig and Holstein. At the same time the States of Southern Germany were brought into close military relation with Prussia, which was now recognized as the head of a North German Confederacy.

It only needed threatened peril or aggression from without to unite the Southern States with the northern group, and to substitute an Empire for a Confederacy. The jealousy of the French people and the impolicy of Napoleon III. prepared for this result by precipitating the war of 1870. Close upon the news of victory followed the proclamation of the new German Empire. In an address to the German people, Jan. 18, 1871, King William declared that, in response to the request of German princes and free cities, he had concluded to assume the imperial dignity. Two months later occurred the first meeting of the Imperial Parliament.

In the foreign policy of the realm the management of Bismarck was undoubtedly a marked success; and so far as the founding of the Empire was dependent upon that management, its existence is a monument to the sagacity and well-directed daring of the great minister. In supervising internal affairs, on the other hand, he encountered a fair share of checks and reverses. A strong opposition party was ever on hand. Since the inauguration of the Empire two factors in particular have been a source of disquiet and perplexity,—clericalism and socialism. Our next topic will give occasion to refer to the former; a sentence or two may properly be given here to a notice of the latter.

As represented by its first organizer, Lassalle, who died in 1864, German socialism, or social democracy, was not of the most extravagant type. Its aim was rather to reform, than to disintegrate and to reconstruct society. State supervision, used for the benefit of the working classes, was to be the principal means of ameliorating the condition of the toiling mass. But this

moderate programme was soon changed by the addition of a revolutionary element. Under the inspiration of such teachers as Karl Marx, not a few socialists began to agitate in favor of communistic doctrines, and to assail the existing order of society in its foundations. A comparatively free course was given to the party for a score of years, and it continually advanced in strength. At length in 1878 a double attempt upon the life of the Emperor, by fanatical representatives of the faction, gave the government a favorable opportunity to use repressive measures. The meetings of socialists were put under the ban, and their publications were suppressed. Such means forced them to employ less ostentatious methods of propagandism. They were not, however, driven from the field, and a modified type of socialistic teaching remains a considerable factor in German politics.

II. — THE CHURCH IN GERMANY VIEWED PRINCIPALLY IN ITS RELATION TO THE STATE.

The extensive prerogatives in the management of ecclesiastical affairs which the peculiar conditions of the Reformation era had devolved upon the State were continued into the nineteenth century. The consistorial form of church government, which was dominant in Germany in the early part of the century, gave the real headship to the temporal ruler, since the members of the consistory were rather his agents, than representatives of the congregations. From this point, however, there has been a tendency toward freedom and self-action, as is apparent from the rise of separatists, the

formation of free associations, and the introduction of the synodal or representative system. The State has by no means withdrawn its hand from ecclesiastical affairs, but in tolerating or sanctioning these developments it has enlarged the area of self-action for religious society.

A principal source of separatism lay in opposition to the Union which had been initiated in Prussia in 1817, and had been copied in several other sections of Germany. While Frederic William III., in publishing the Union, had disclaimed any intent to interfere with doctrinal standards, a suspicion arose in some minds that the outcome of his scheme would be a lapse from dogmatic definiteness, a sliding away from the robust creeds of the fathers. Moreover, the action of the monarch in providing a liturgy (1821) for the Union Church was regarded as a marked departure from a neutral position, since the liturgy had its doctrinal implications. Thus a double grievance was afforded. While the Union was considered as being in itself a stroke for latitudinarianism, the King's liturgy was looked upon as a positive means for educating the people away from the teachings of a pure and stanch orthodoxy. As was noticed previously, zealous Lutherans in particular felt aggrieved. The subject of the liturgy received indeed a relative settlement (1828-29), most of the clergy and the people being satisfied with the measure of discretion in the use of liturgical forms which the government came to allow. There was a minority, however, especially in Silesia, which was not easily appeased. Resisting the pressure toward conformity which was brought to bear upon them, they assumed an independent status (1830-35). During the reign of Frederic William III. the

separatists were treated with much rigor. More indulgence was awarded them after the accession of Frederic William IV. They were allowed in 1841 to frame a constitution at a general synod held in Breslau, and four years later legal recognition was given to their standing as that of an independent Lutheran Church.

About the time that this separation in the interest of strict Lutheranism was sanctioned, a very different incentive gave rise to a number of free congregations. In this latter separation the most conspicuous leaders were connected with an association which is known as the "Friends of Light." They were heirs to the teachings of Wegscheider, and, in opposition to a tendency to enthrone the old confessions, they endeavored to spread a popularized rationalism. Not being allowed the desired liberty within the Church, they took their adherents outside. Several large congregations were formed. Their prosperity, however, was but transient. The alleged connection of these free churches with political radicalism was very prejudicial to their interests in the midst of the reaction which followed the scenes of 1848.

As a further example of separatism we may mention the pietistic communities established at Kornthal and Wilhelmsdorf (1819, 1828) in Würtemberg, under the leadership of Gottlieb Wilhelm Hoffmann. In their general character these communities were very similar to those of the Moravians. Near the time of their institution a few adherents were won in Würtemberg by the Baptists and the Swedenborgians.

In 1847 the Prussian government gave in effect a declaration of its intention to tolerate dissent, inasmuch as it specified the conditions on which independent congregations might be formed.

Among the associations for religious ends which have flourished in the period, a place of distinction belongs to the Gustavus Adolphus Society. This was organized in 1842-43, and in harmony with its name was designed to support and further the Protestant interest. It was sufficiently broad in its basis to include different communions and theological parties. Numerous churches, some of them being outside of Germany, have been assisted from the funds of the society. At a recent date it numbered upwards of seventeen hundred branches. The so-called Protestant Society which arose about twenty years later had a different import. In opposition to confessionalism it sought to champion a kind of Broad Church scheme. The Evangelical League (*Der Evangelische Bund*), organized in 1887, was designed to serve as a defence both against Romanism and indifferentism.

As respects the synodal organization, it was late in the century, or more than fifty years, after Schleiermacher had made a plea in its behalf, before it was properly installed. Some of the smaller States had indeed given it an introduction at an earlier date; but in Prussia the epoch of its general adoption was 1873 and the years immediately following. In the scheme which was then put into operation, provision was made for district, provincial, and general synods. "The General Synod has the task of 'caring for the maintenance and the growth of the national Church upon the basis of the evangelical confession.' Laws of the national Church require its assent; still, a law passed by it is not to be presented to the King for definitive confirmation without the approval of the State ministry.

It meets every six years; in the interim it is represented (as is the case with the Provincial Synods) by officers of its own choice. The government of the Church culminates in the Superior Consistory, whose president also countersigns ecclesiastical laws which have been confirmed by the King. The right of nominating to this office belongs to the minister of public worship; the other members of the body are proposed by the president with the consent of the minister. Taxes voted by the General Synod for the purposes of the national Church require the consent of the State ministry, and must, when they exceed four per cent of the class and income tax, be approved by the House of Representatives, which decides yearly on disbursements for the administration of the Church.”¹

Somewhat of an offset to the concessions made by the State to the Church had place at least for a season, in consequence of what has been named the *Kulturkampf* (as though it touched the general interests of culture or civilization), but which might quite as well be called the struggle with Romish clericalism. The extent to which the State, in the course of this struggle, was led to assume control over theological education, as also over other matters of immediate concern to the Church, was regarded by not a few Protestants as exceeding the just limits of secular authority. On the part of the State authorities themselves, it was rather a perplexing exigency, than a desire to magnify their own prerogatives, which dictated the restrictive legislation. To appreciate that exigency it will be necessary to glance for a moment at the origin and progress of the contention.

¹ Kurtz, Kirchengeschichte, § 196, 5.

In looking for the origin of the *Kulturkampf* it is necessary to cast a glance over the events which occurred between the years 1866 and 1871: the victories of Prussia over Austria and France; her consequent advance to the imperial headship; the declaration of papal infallibility at the Vatican council; the downfall of the Pope's temporal rule; the appearance in the Prussian and the Imperial Parliament of the so-called party of the Centre, composed mainly of a clerical faction intent solely on championing the interests of the Roman Catholic Church; the use of clerical supervision over education, especially in the Polish districts, in behalf of an Ultramontane or anti-German propagandism; and finally the rise in Germany of an Old Catholic communion, that is, a communion that wished to be Catholic, but was not willing to be Romish to the extent of extirpating intellect or conscience before the dogma of papal infallibility.

These events were closely connected in the way of action and reaction. The feeling which led Cardinal Antonelli to exclaim, when he heard of the Austrian defeat at Sadowa, "The world is going to ruin!" had a place in the hearts of many German Romanists, especially after the record of Sedan was added to that of Sadowa. The victories of Prussia, as Bishop Ketteler of Mayence acknowledged in a communication to Bismarck, were regarded as actual or threatened defeats of the Romish religion. The overthrow of the Pope's temporal power at this juncture tended to increase apprehension and disquiet. Under the pressure of this anxiety, zealous Romanists, instead of adopting the policy of patient waiting, began to agitate, to demand guarantees, and to

mass their forces for political effect. While the minds of a majority of the citizens were occupied with the new prospects which were opening before the German people, these anxious subjects of the Roman pontiff made their Church the one interest. Working with great activity in the election of October, 1870, they secured, to the surprise of the nation, a large number of deputies in the Prussian Parliament who were fully committed to a clerical or Ultramontane policy. At the same time a vigorous effort was made to influence the government to interfere for the restoration of the Pope's temporal dominion. Before the evacuation of France the matter began to be urged, large delegations waiting upon the Emperor at Versailles for the specific purpose to influence him to vindicate the papal claim against united Italy. Supplementing these lines of action was the industrious effort of the Jesuits and others to stir up the lower ranks of Roman Catholics, and to beget in them an essential, if not an open, hostility to the Empire. The work of these agitators assumed a specially serious aspect in the newly acquired French provinces and in Polish Prussia.

Naturally it was not pleasing to the government, at a great national crisis, to be thus confronted by an opposition party, especially by a party which borrowed its politics from its ecclesiasticism, and made Germany secondary to Rome. It was a case both for irritation and perplexity. As Romanism had become an aggressive political faction, under able leaders, like Mallinkrodt and Windthorst, it seemed to be a necessity to adopt some prudential measures. Moreover, it was not easy to maintain a neutral or passive attitude, in view of the fact that Romish authorities claimed the services of the

government to expel anti-infallibilists from their position as teachers. This was an odious requisition, since the dogma of papal infallibility was at once an innovation, a dogma whose enactment had been vehemently opposed by a large proportion of the German bishops, and a dogma too which must be regarded as either a downright threat against the autonomy of every government having any considerable percentage of Roman Catholic subjects, or a wretched and inane piece of theoretical trumpery, fashioned only for the purpose of being laid away upon the shelf. The government accordingly refused to lend its aid for persecuting those teachers who declined to accept the dogma of papal infallibility. This was a direct occasion of antagonism with the hierarchy. It is probable also that the presence of an Old Catholic or anti-infallibilist element contributed in another sense to the conflict. The expectation that this element would show no inconsiderable strength encouraged the government to proceed with more boldness than might have been exhibited had it realized that it must deal with an essentially undivided Roman Catholic body.

If the provocation was not slight, it was quite matched by the sweeping measures to which the government resorted. Most of these had reference to Prussia alone. A few of them were issued under imperial authority.

In the list of important measures called forth by the exigency two belong to the year 1872. An act was passed in March of that year which declared the inspection of all schools, public or private, to be in the hands of the State. The design of the act was not to displace clerical inspectors as a body from the oversight of schools, but to provide a distinct ground for their remo-

val in cases where it might seem to be required by public interests. A few months later, by action of the Reichstag or Imperial Parliament, the Empire was made forbidden ground to the Jesuits and the kindred orders; that is, their houses were suppressed, and the foreign members were given leave of absence from the realm. The Redemptorists, the Lazarists, the Priests of the Holy Spirit, and the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus were included in the proscription.

Laws giving application to State authority in a very trenchant and sweeping manner were issued in May, 1873, under the ministry of Dr. Falk. By these "May laws" it was forbidden an ecclesiastic to inflict penalties for a point of conduct outside of the religious domain, or for the exercise of any function which the State recognized as part of civil duty or privilege. It was ordained that a candidate for an ecclesiastical office must not be a foreigner; that he must not be objectionable to the government; that he must have studied theology for three years at a German university, besides having passed through a gymnasium, and being able to give satisfactory evidence of acquaintance with philosophy, history, and German literature. In lieu of the University, it was allowed that a Church seminary might conduct the education of priests in provinces where a theological faculty was wanting, with the understanding, however, that the seminary must be approved by the minister of public worship. All schools connected with ministerial training were declared to be under the supervision of the State, and teachers therein under obligation to meet its standard of scholarly attainments. It was asserted that the State has the right of objection against nominees to ecclesiastical offices, that

incumbents of such offices are not to be deprived of them without regular process, and that the civil authority can proceed to deprivation when it seems to be required by public order. To these laws some others were added in the following two or three years, including the requisition of a stringent oath from the bishops and the enactment of civil marriage. The latter was made a law of the Empire in 1875, and was designed, among other ends, to meet the case of betrothed persons to whom the Romish clergy might refuse the marriage ceremony, because of their non-acceptance of the dogma of infallibility.

The general attitude of the hierarchy toward this legislation was one of stubborn resistance. As the government acted with resolution, the sharp edge of its laws touched not a few. By 1876 seven out of the twelve bishoprics in Prussia were vacant, and four hundred parishes were without pastors.

A very considerable spur was given to the contest by the ill-concealed animosity of Pius IX. His refusal in 1872 to allow Cardinal Hohenlohe, who had been selected to represent the German government at the Vatican, to fulfil that office was not regarded as a friendly act. In the same year he commented bitterly on the expulsion of the Jesuits, and declared his expectation that the administrators of the Empire would soon pay the full penalty for their aggression against the Church, since a stone would be unloosed from the height which would crush the foot of the colossus. In 1873 the Pope had the effrontery, in a letter to the Emperor, to remind him that all baptized persons belonged in a manner to the Pope — a kind of property-

right which the Emperor in his reply did not fail to repudiate. Two years later, in a circular letter to the Prussian bishops, the belligerent pontiff assumed to nullify the laws of the realm.

The struggle, in short, was in no small degree a quarrel between Bismarck and Pius IX. The intent of the government in passing the "May laws" was to provide itself with defensive weapons. It was not apprehended that it would be necessary to use those weapons very largely, and the extent to which they were at length employed was a matter of regret to the government. On its part, it was ready at an early date, if not to abrogate the laws, at least to moderate their execution. But the temper of Pius IX. in no wise encouraged an attempt at settlement.

With the accession of Leo XIII. in 1878 the conditions were greatly changed. The tone of the new pontiff was moderate and conciliatory. In assuming an irenic attitude, therefore, Bismarck was not guilty of a sudden change of front, but was adopting a course which he had previously declared might become feasible when another than Pius IX. should be in the papal chair. The danger of attack from without made it expedient to moderate the religious grievance which was a select weapon in the hands of the clerical party for antagonizing the will of the government at every point. An inclination to ameliorate the obnoxious legislation was consequently exhibited, and most of it was cancelled by the year 1887. The Pope on his part gratified the government by instructing the clerical party to favor the scheme which was pending for sustaining and increasing the military strength of the realm. This instruction

proved to be far from agreeable to the special friends of his Holiness. They were more than ready to antagonize the government in behalf of the Pope, but it went sadly against their grain to favor the government even at the solicitation of the Pope. Accordingly, Windthorst and many of his followers in the party of the Centre discarded the papal instructions. The end of the *Kulturkampf* had accordingly an ingredient of comedy.¹

As was intimated, the record of the struggle makes an exceptional chapter in the history of the relations between Church and State. With the settlement just noted matters returned to about the same status which existed when an intemperate clericalism precipitated the strife.

In considering the inter-relations of Church and State we have noticed the principal developments in German Protestantism, aside from the field of theological thought. Somewhat of a supplement, however, might be made to our sketch. It would be appropriate to notice the work of practical Christian benevolence; for this has had its worthy apostles in Germany within the present century. Here belong Wichern, whose name is held in honor as a founder of the "Inner Mission," and Fliedner, whose deaconess institute at Kaiserswerth has been an influential model, helping to bring about a healthful and much-needed extension of woman's work within the bounds of Protestantism. Reference might also be made to a considerable group of Christian lyrists who have written within the last two generations. As prominent representatives of the group we may mention Albert Knapp and Carl Johann Philipp Spitta.

¹ Wiermann, *Geschichte des Kulturkampfes*, is among the more valuable sources on the general subject.

III.—PROMINENT DEVELOPMENTS IN GERMAN THEOLOGY.

In the third decade of the present century the most influential factors in German theology were Schleiermacher and Hegel,—the one emphasizing the element of feeling and proclaiming a relative separation of religion from theological speculation, the other giving the primacy to intellect, and insisting upon insight into reality. For a time Hegelianism promised to be the stronger factor; but its doubtful tendencies were so soon brought to the light that its reign was broken, and the system of Schleiermacher proved its title to a larger and more permanent influence. A third factor which shared the field with these two may be described as the party of conservative Lutheranism.

While the course of Hegelianism, at least on the part of a conspicuous fraction of its adherents, was from professed orthodoxy to radical heterodoxy, the School of Schleiermacher, as has been remarked on a preceding page, had more of orthodox leanings than the master.

Among the more prominent disciples of Schleiermacher were included Neander, Nitzsch, Ullmann, Twesten, and Julius Müller. As a teacher, Neander commanded an almost unrivalled influence. This was due in no small degree to his unique character. Distinguished by childlike simplicity, a stranger to self-seeking, singularly unworldly in spirit, abandoning himself without reserve to the supreme aims of religion, and sympathizing fully with Christianity as a spring of inward life, he deeply affected those who came under his tuition with an impression of his amiability and saintliness. At the same

time he commanded intellectual respect by the vast stores of his learning. More in sympathy with the practical than with the speculative, he may not have been entirely at home in the higher ranges of philosophy and criticism ; still he had enough of the faculty of patient and exact thinking to enable him, with the help of his other gifts, to be one of the best furnished church historians of the century. The way in which he fulfilled his historical task corresponded with his religious temper and principles. He portrays Christianity above all as a life, and evinces much interest in the typical embodiments of that life, the great religious personalities of the centuries. The exact lines and high fences which are ever before the eyes of the zealot for ecclesiasticism claimed from him very slight recognition. As Lichtenberger has well remarked, "The Church whose origin, successive developments, and varied manifestations are related by Neander, is not this or that particular Church, but the Church universal and invisible in its essence ; it is the kingdom of God, the destinies of which are not bound to this or that transitory formula or symbol, or to such or such an imperfect institution. The principal agent which determines its progress is the Holy Spirit, the spirit of Christ acting in the community of believers which He has founded. Accordingly, the duty of preserving intact and of maintaining for the salvation of the world the deposit of the revealed tradition, or the Word of God, is not made incumbent on a privileged caste, a sacerdotal body, a clergy, but on all the members of the Church, on all the believers. Neander insists much on the doctrine of the universal priesthood, and by the way in which he has conceived the relations

between the individual and the Church, he is one of those who have most efficaciously prepared for the triumph of the cause of Christian individualism.”¹

Contemporary with the early disciples of Schleiermacher there was a group of theologians who exhibited in tone and teaching a more positive infusion of Lutheran dogmatism. They were Erastian in their view of church polity, favored the absolutism of the sovereign in their theory of the State, counted it their vocation to overthrow every form of rationalism, and in pursuit of this end were disposed to welcome the intervention of the government. A rude and sincere expression of the orthodox zeal of this party was given by Harms, whose ninety-five theses, published in 1817, attracted some attention. But the central figure for several decades was Hengstenberg, who made his influence felt by his writings on the Old Testament, and still more through the periodical of the party, the “*Evangelical Gazette*.” In his ecclesiastical principles Hengstenberg was a friend of the Union. His friendship, however, was not very vital, and tended toward the advocacy of a minimum of Union with a maximum of confessionalism. In upholding the authority of Scripture he was averse to making any concessions to liberal thinking, and reverted essentially to the seventeenth century theory of inspiration. That he brought ability, learning, and subtlety to the task of Scriptural interpretation cannot well be denied ; nevertheless he was too much the dogmatist and apologist to contribute much of permanent worth to Biblical science. His activity was, doubtless, rewarded by an increase of the conservative element in the ranks of

¹ History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century, pp. 177, 178.

contemporary pastors ; but the result aimed at was only imperfectly reached. A true victory over intemperate liberalism must be won on a broader basis than that which underlay the writings of this resolute and persistent controversialist. Among those who may be compared with Hengstenberg in their general aim and theological standpoint were Hahn, Harless, and Guericke.

During the first stages of these developments, Hegelianism maintained its misty alliance with Christian theology, much to the satisfaction of its more orthodox votaries ; but the year 1835 brought a radical disturbance. The "Life of Jesus" by David Strauss, whatever sense of panic it may have caused in the ranks of other parties, was especially disastrous to the Hegelian school, acting as a precipitate within that school, and bringing to light the thorough alienation from all positive religion into which a part of the Hegelians were gravitating.

The extraordinary effect of Strauss' "*Leben Jesu*" was due to its form and spirit as well as to its underlying theory. Strauss was in no small degree a literary artist, an adept in disposing his materials so as to convey an impression of clearness and mastery. His work gathered up and presented in a striking manner elements of criticism which had entered here and there into theological literature. It derived, also, an immense advantage from its courteous tone ; the reader was not asked to do despite to feeling and conviction by charging conscious fraud upon the authors of the New Testament. By means of his mythical hypothesis Strauss could put on an air of politeness while banishing all the super-

natural and taking out very largely the remaining framework of history from the New Testament. A mythical tendency, as he conceived, wrought in the early Christian community with the force of a creative imagination. Thus inward beliefs and convictions relating to the Messianic ideal were objectified into historical pictures, and a large addition was made to the real facts of Christ's life, while yet there was no positive design of invention. Surely, if the substance of the gospel history was to be dissipated, this was the least obnoxious way to accomplish the feat! No wonder that a stir was made in theological circles. The relative agreeableness of the method of attack was rightly regarded as making it peculiarly insidious. Numerous replies accordingly followed. That of Ullmann was among the most successful, and was treated by Strauss with special deference.

At a later period in his life Strauss cancelled, at least in part, the feature of distinctive advantage in the "Leben Jesu" of 1835. In the treatise on the same subject which he addressed to the German people in 1864, he gave a place to conscious invention in the gospel history. This was a virtual confession of the insufficiency of the mythical hypothesis, an opening of the door to the crude assault which he had thought to avoid. In writing this second life of Christ, Strauss received an incentive from Renan, whose "Vie de Jésu" appeared in 1862. The romancing work of the French writer shows more of popular gift than that of the German, but also more arbitrariness and superficiality in criticism.

The original theory of Strauss — not to mention more specific objections — violates a sound historic sense in

the position and character which it assigns to Christ. As Dorner remarks, it is one of the best-established points of history that the central feature of Christianity, as the religion of reconciliation, which was clearly recognized in the apostolic and post-apostolic Church, must rest back upon the deeds and sayings of Christ. It is unthinkable that the very first generations of Christians, as the Apocalypse and the Pauline epistles prove to have been the case, should have thought most emphatically of Christ as Mediator and Redemer, unless He had presented Himself in that character. The expectation that He would come in glory to judge the world, which Strauss admits to have been a prevalent expectation among the primitive Christians, points likewise to the conclusion that Christ must have claimed exalted prerogatives, and set Himself forth as an object of religious faith. It avails little, then, to put off the composition of the gospel narratives till near the middle of the second century, in order to make out that the picture which they contain is essentially mythical, the result of gradual accretion upon a moderate basis of fact. There is no honest escape from the conclusion that in His own representation, and not merely in the exaggerating fancy of a later age, Christ stood on a plane of supernatural dignity. Either, then, He actually possessed such a dignity, or He was an enthusiast who had utterly lost the way of sobriety through pride, self-deception, or mental confusion. The simple picture of a Jewish rabbi with an exceptional genius for religious truth, which was drawn by Strauss, is inadmissible. One must acknowledge verity in the high claims of the gospel narratives, or imitate the hardihood of Renan in portraying the

Founder of Christianity as a bewildered enthusiast. And what savors less of sobriety and credibility than this latter procedure, — this assigning of narrowness and confusion of mind to one whose singular and growing mastery over the race, as well as the habitual serenity of His bearing in the gospel scenes, argues rather unique breadth, clearness, and penetration of spiritual vision, and pre-eminent balance of religious judgment?

Strauss in his "*Leben Jesu*" assumed, rather than industriously justified, his view respecting the late appearance of the canonical Gospels. To establish a critical warrant for dissipating the structure of New Testament history was work that still remained to be done. In Ferdinand Christian Baur a remarkably capable instrument for this task was provided. Few abler theological writers, and none more laborious, have appeared in the century. His breadth and diligence, however, did not exclude a special one-sidedness. In harmony with the Hegelian philosophy, he was inclined to underrate the personal factor in history, and to regard all forward movement as the resultant of conflicting ideas. Taking no adequate account, therefore, of the personality of Christ, he looked to a struggle of opinions for the genesis of the religious faith which is mirrored in the accepted canon of the New Testament.

The way in which Baur utilized a supposed antagonism between Petrinism and Paulinism for reconstructing apostolic history has been sufficiently elucidated in another connection.¹ It falls to us here simply to notice the fact that his theory has not been able to maintain itself, in its full length and breadth, in his own school.

¹ *Early Church*, pp. 52-62.

The most eminent of his disciples have conceded to the gospels an earlier origin than he assumed, have accepted as genuine various epistles of Paul which he pronounced spurious, and have qualified the alleged antagonism between Petrinism and Paulinism.

In the more recent developments of German theology a conspicuous place has been occupied by three different parties; namely, the Mediation School, the Confessional School, and the Neo-Kantian School, or School of Ritschl.

The first of these can be defined only by its general aim, as it has no very exact platform. It seeks to unite the truth of supernaturalism with the truth of rationalism, allowing the fact of positive revelation, but emphasizing the idea that this revelation has proceeded by a rational process, or in conformity with the unfolding receptivity of men as intellectual and spiritual beings. It applies its reconciling effort also to the relation between the past and the present, between the Church and the individual, attributing large worth to the inheritance of theological thought from the past, and confessing the dependence of the individual for the proper nurture of his religious life upon a sympathetic relation with the Christian communion; but at the same time refusing to find in the standards of the past a hard and fast rule, and insisting that the liberty of the individual must not be eliminated in the name of the authority of the communion. From this description it is plain that the scheme of the Mediation School lacks some of the necessary elements of popularity. It is not sufficiently definite and apprehensible to take hold of commonplace minds. The aim of the school nevertheless is laudable and

entirely germane to Christian philosophy; moreover, the failure to compact a large party is far from being a decisive proof of small influence in the theological world. Great numbers, outside of Germany as well as in Germany, have been moulded in no small degree by the literature which has emanated from this source.

Among the distinguished names which may be assigned with more or less propriety to the Mediation School are those of Tholuck, Hagenbach, Dorner, and Rothe. The last two in particular have earned the appreciation of a wide and thoughtful constituency. Some reviewers have indeed spoken rather disparagingly of Dorner, but the patient research and wide vision shown in his works afford a basis for an enviable reputation. Pfleiderer does not hesitate to place him in the front rank of the eclectic, mediating theologians. "The most important of these theologians," he says, "and the type of the whole school was indisputably Isaac August Dorner, who possessed a deeply reflective Swabian nature, profound religious earnestness, and a vivid sense of the need of sounding by thought the depths of the truths of Christianity dear to his heart. His "*Glaubenslehre*" is a work extremely rich in thought and matter.¹

Rothe claims esteem by the double title of a noble and deeply religious nature, and a unique power of constructive thinking. In his most elaborate work, the "*Theological Ethics*," he has exhibited an organizing talent, a faculty for developing the vast theme of Christian truth from a special point of view, which recalls the great work of Schleiermacher. In method he reminds

¹ *The Development of Theology in Germany since Kant*, p. 156.

of Hegel; in content, of Schleiermacher and the most eminent of the later theosophists. "His method," says Pfleiderer, "is deductive construction by means of speculative ideas, resulting in a Christian system of philosophy, to which the supernaturalism of the Bible, the theosophy of Schelling and Oetinger, and the theology of Schleiermacher have been made to contribute." In harmony with his predilection for speculation of a theosophic cast, Rothe takes large account of nature as the eternal companion of spirit, and makes the spiritualization of the sensuous component in man's composite being a prominent aspect of the redemptive process.

The Confessional or Neo-Lutheran School found its more immediate occasion in the reaction which followed the political overturning of 1848. From that date a party came into the field to which even the orthodoxy of Hengstenberg was not sufficiently stanch and churchly. An opponent has thus described its tendency: "Modern Confessionalism sets forth openly as its foremost design the exaltation of the Church to dominion over theology, and the fitting of [theological] science to the measuring scale of the external juristic position of the Church."¹ As this imports, the Confessional School makes little account of the invisible side of the Church, and looks upon it mainly as a definite institute invested with a certain list of rights and prerogatives. In this legal outfit of the Church it regards the creeds which have been authoritatively established as especially important. Orthodox teaching and sacramental efficacy receive the main emphasis in its scheme, and the pietistic concep-

¹ Karl Schwarz, *Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie*, p. 363.

tion of religion is reprobated as savoring of unhealthy subjectivity. In the earlier years of the party much stress was laid upon the priestly authority of the pastors and their absolving function; but the cool manner in which the people received these high claims was a decided and somewhat effective invitation to modesty.

The above description, it should be noted, applies more especially to the initial stage of the Confessional School, and cannot be taken as an exact picture of the party in its entirety, since considerable diversities have arisen within its ranks. While on its extreme side, as represented by Klieforth and Vilmar, the Confessional School stands for a kind of German Puseyism, it counts many theologians of too great moderation and rational breadth to be properly described by this phrase. Some who have been currently associated with the school have not even been careful to conserve all points of the old Lutheran Orthodoxy, as may be seen from the writings of Thomasius, Hofmann, and Kahn. Perhaps the last of these should be regarded as having moved out of the confessional camp. Among recent supporters of confessionalism much prominence belongs to Luthardt of Leipzig and Frank of Erlangen. The former unites with the talent of the polished writer much gift for practical activity; the latter is a patient and cogent thinker, and ranks with the ablest of the conservative theologians in Germany.

The term Neo-Kantian, which has been applied to the School of Ritschl, has its justification. Ritschl professed, indeed, to agree in his theory of cognition with Lotze rather than with Kant, as affirming a knowledge of things through phenomena, rather than making the

phenomenal the whole subject of knowledge; still his thinking had its points of resemblance to cardinal features of the Kantian system. The general opposition between the speculative and the practical reason, the despair of reaching a valid explication of Deity by the metaphysical method, and the limitation of emphasis to such aspects of religious truth as have a distinct value for the moral consciousness, which were characteristic of Kant's teaching, reappear in the system of Ritschl. The latter, however, differs from the former in assigning a higher worth to positive revelation.

As the theology of Ritschl is of a distinctive cast, and has won a large number of disciples in recent years, it may not be inappropriate to note some of its principal items, as they appear in his chief work, "The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation."¹

The perusal of this work must leave the impression that Ritschl designs to make much account of Biblical authority. A religion like Christianity, whose aim is to unite men in one great spiritual communion, must, he maintains, have its content expressed in the person and work of the founder; only thus are the requisite unity and historical continuity provided for. The person and work of Christ are normative for our conceptions of Christianity. The oracles which supply trustworthy information respecting the person and work of Christ are the writings of the foundation-epoch, the books of the New Testament. These books constitute a well-defined group. They are separated from all other writings of that or the following epoch, in that they are

¹ Die Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung. 2te Auflage, 1882.

harmoniously related to the preceding dispensation and reflect an authentic understanding of the Old Testament religion; whereas other writings, whether proceeding from Jewish or Gentile Christians, are clearly wanting in this respect. There is abundant reason therefore to base Christian theology solely upon the books of the New Testament, reference to the Old Testament being important mainly as supplying means for understanding the New.

In treating of the person of Christ, Ritschl assumes to keep within the Biblical point of view. He discards the dogmatic construction which the Church has wrought out upon the subject. The way in which Christ became what He was, he says, is not a proper theme for theological investigation; that question lies beyond our province. We must take Christ as He is presented to us, estimating His person by His official position and the work which He has accomplished. The result reached on this basis seems to be, that, while there is no distinct specification respecting the essence of the Redeemer, the practical value of divinity is assigned to Him. He reflects the divine attributes, and asserts over the race an unlimited moral lordship. "An authority which excludes all other standards or subordinates them to itself, which at the same time fundamentally directs all human trust in God, has the worth of divinity."

Ritschl adopts also a negative attitude toward the conclusions of the old theology on the attributes of God, and assumes to give a more Biblical exposition of the subject. He objects to placing an attribute back of the will of God and regarding the latter as determined by the former. In accordance with this view, he repu-

diates the notion that righteousness in God involves a demand for retribution which must be met. That idea, he maintains, is no Biblical idea, but a foreign growth, a portion of the Pharisaic and the Hellenic world-view which has unwisely been imported into theology.

God's attitude toward the race is not represented in the Bible as one of wrath, nor is redemption represented as a deliverance from wrath. In the New Testament the wrath of God is associated altogether with the closing up of the dispensation, and denotes the divine retribution which will then befall those who have arrayed themselves against God's kingdom.

In conformity with the above, the conclusion is drawn that God's relation to the redemptive work is not to be described under judicial or governmental terms. In the scheme of reconciliation He does not stand forth as judge or ruler. The dominant conception of God in the New Testament is that He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the relation in which He stands to Christ shapes the conception of His relation to men. As Christ Himself taught with sufficient distinctness, God approaches men in the character of father, and forgives their sins in that character.

The work of Christ was to reveal and make effective the benevolent intent of God; no vicarious satisfaction was required. Christ did not and could not bear the penalty which properly attaches to sinners, since the essential characteristic of that penalty is the feeling of guilt and of consequent separation from divine communion. His sufferings had worth as exhibiting the worth of His person; they gave occasion to patient endurance,

and were a test of fidelity. His death expresses the culmination of His righteous obedience. Accordingly, in New Testament language, the death of Christ is a compendious expression for His faithful fulfilment of the entire charge committed to His hands.

An advantageous word for representing the redemptive agency of Christ is the word *calling*, or *vocation*. He wrought out salvation by the fulfilment of His calling, and that calling was the founding of a spiritual kingdom, a universal religious communion in which the law of love has the supremacy. “In the view of Christ, the assuring to mankind universal forgiveness of sins, and the founding of a communion whose members recognize in God as His Father also their Father, are ideas of like meaning.”

The more immediate relation of Christ is with the communion, and it is within the communion that the individual is made a recipient of justification. By justification may be understood the fundamental relation toward God in which the communion, originated through the accomplished work of Christ, is placed. The love of God toward the obedient head of the communion is fittingly extended to the members.

The stress which Ritschl places upon the communion is followed up by adverse comments upon such systems of religious thought as lay the main emphasis upon the direct relation of the believer to Christ, and make much account of his subjective states. His attitude toward pietism is one of conspicuous hostility. It should be noticed, however, that Ritschl in emphasizing the importance of the communion meant to pay no tribute to sacerdotal or hierarchical notions. He denotes by this

term a fellowship in which the chief bond of union is a common pursuit of the great ends of the divine kingdom.

The system of Ritschl is undoubtedly wrought out with ability; it has too its suggestive features. We may be permitted, however, to doubt its capacity to afford permanent satisfaction. In its agnostic attitude toward the realm of metaphysical inquiry, it gives inadequate recognition to the philosophizing faculty, which, indeed, needs to be guarded from arrogating too much to itself, but has, nevertheless, its rights in connection with the themes of religion. While thus it fails in part to meet the demands of intellectual ambition, it has its deficit on the side of heart piety. In its radical opposition to the pietistic conception of religion, and in its interpretation of justification as primarily a gift to the communion, it dims the sense of vital relation between the individual and God.

In his spirit and bearing Ritschl ranked with Dorner and Rothe among the eminent religious personalities of Germany in recent times. Here lies the explanation of no inconsiderable portion of his influence. Probably also the fact that he began his career in the School of Baur, and advanced toward a view of the New Testament more nearly Catholic than that of the great Tübingen critic, has served to widen the circle of appreciative attention.

Prominent representatives of the School of Ritschl in the field of dogmatics are Herrmann and Kaftan. Harnack holds a foremost place as a historian. In each of these writers it is rather the general standpoint of Ritschl which appears than exact reproduction of his system. An opposing liberal school finds in Otto Pflei-

derer an able spokesman. Pfleiderer is in the line of succession from Hegel and Baur, but differs from either to an appreciable degree.

The works of Strauss and Baur afforded occasion for a thorough canvassing of the field of New Testament criticism. More recently a corresponding radicalism in dealing with the Old Testament, on the part of Wellhausen and others, has directed much scholarly research to the Hebrew Scriptures, the main problem being the origin of the earlier books of the Hebrew canon. The result has been, that the traditional theory of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch has undergone more or less modification in the minds of a large proportion of theologians. As the critical movement is still in course, it is difficult to forecast its ultimate outcome; meanwhile only those who entertain a narrow and technical view of the Bible have any cause for disturbing apprehensions.

No system of German philosophy which has arisen since the time of Hegel has been brought into close alliance with theology. The pessimistic speculations of Schopenhauer and Hartmann have offered, of course, nothing congenial to Christian faith. Ritschl, as was noticed above, confessed a certain agreement with Lotze; but we are not aware that his school makes any very special account of the system of this genial and able philosophical teacher and writer. In its main features Lotze's philosophy lies quite as near to Christian tenets as most of its predecessors in Germany within the modern era. It is true that in seeking a speculative account of the fact of interaction between the different members or parts of the universe he uses language that is formally pantheistic; but it is to be noticed that he

disowns the cardinal tenets which are ordinarily associated with pantheism, emphasizing very strongly the personality of God, and accepting the reality of design and freedom. His philosophy is opposed to materialism, and is idealistic much in the Leibnitzian sense.

IV. — OUTLINES OF PROTESTANT HISTORY IN VARIOUS PORTIONS OF THE CONTINENT.

In the fifth decade of the nineteenth century another was added to the list of armed conflicts which are recorded in the religious history of Switzerland. The outbreak was less a sign of intolerant feeling in the mass of the people belonging to either religion than of the aggressive policy of the Jesuits. In the preceding twenty years they had so far obtained the control of the Roman Catholic cantons as to shape their political action. As a consequence of their manœuvring, seven cantons, in violation of the integrity of the Swiss Confederacy, formed a special league. This led to a struggle in 1847, the result of which was the abrogation of the special league, and sentence of banishment against the Jesuits.

In German Switzerland, the tendency to liberalism, in the sense of very faint dogmatic requirements for either preacher or communicant, has widely prevailed. Though the call of Strauss to the University of Zürich in 1839 was defeated by a popular protest, rationalistic teaching has been dominant in the theological faculty. Biedermann is known as one of its most distinguished exponents. In Basle, evangelical theology has in large part held the field. Among its representatives Hagen-

bach has won an enviable reputation by the broad and religious spirit of his writings, as well as by his scholarship. In the theological faculty of Bern, a rather free-spirited type of mediation theology has had currency.

In French Switzerland, the evangelistic labors of Madam von Krüdener, and still more those of the Scotchman, Robert Haldane, started a fruitful impulse in the direction of earnest piety and faith; the latter won to his cause the gifted and eloquent Cæsar Malan (1817). Though frowned upon by the government, and ill-treated by the populace, the earnest men persisted in their work, and an independent church was formed at Geneva, which, in 1832, was equipped with a theological school. Among the scholarly representatives of the movement, Merle d'Aubigné and Gaussem are widely known. The independent communion reacted with good effect upon the established Church.

The neighboring canton of Vaud shared in some measure the pietistic impulse which had been started at Geneva. Owing to obnoxious action of the government, a free church was also formed in this canton (1845-47); The new organization had the good fortune to take its impress very largely from Alexander Vinet, who occupied the chair of practical theology at Lausanne from 1837 to 1845, and who was on general principles an earnest advocate of the separation of Church and State. In Neufchâtel, likewise, the action of the cantonal government occasioned, in 1873, the rise of a free church, within whose ranks was included the celebrated exegete, Frederic Godet.

The evangelical movement in French Switzerland made its contribution to the Reformed Church in

France. Vinet served in particular as a medium of transmission. Among those who were the first to share his spirit none obtained a higher name for eloquence and consecrated industry than Adolphe Monod (1802–1856).

French Protestantism, like that of the neighboring countries, has exhibited from the early part of the century its opposing currents. One wing has been characterized by a pronounced dislike of creed restrictions. In its more conservative representatives this wing approaches the doctrinal position of Channing, with some abatement from his belief in the supernatural character of the New Testament history and oracles ; in its more radical adherents it approaches the position of Renan as respects its free dealing with the objective foundation of religion. Representatives of the one or the other phase are Coquerel (father and son), Colani, Reuss, Schérer, Paschoud, Réville, and Pécaut.

In 1848 some of those who wished for a definite theological basis expressed their dissatisfaction with the existing laxity by leaving the established Reformed Church and instituting the Free Church. The movement was led by Frederic Monod, and was joined by De Pressensé, father and son, the latter of whom has obtained celebrity as a theological writer. Bersier and Bost were also connected with the Free Church for a time, but returned at length to the older communion. Meanwhile the orthodox party in the latter was not willing to surrender all demands for positive articles of faith. Under the leadership of the statesman Guizot this wing was victorious at the conference of 1864, and secured by a decided majority a declaration in favor of

the authority of the Bible, and of the divinity and redemptive work of Christ. At the synod of 1872 the preponderance was also on the conservative side, and a tolerably positive declaration of faith was adopted.

The Lutheran Church in France was much reduced by the transference of Alsace-Lorraine to the German Empire after the Franco-Prussian War. Out of two hundred and seventy-eight parishes only sixty-four were left on French soil. A recent estimate has placed the number of French Protestants in the Reformed Church at 560,000, in the Lutheran at 90,000. Evangelists from Great Britain have also established Protestant services at various points.

In the Reformed Church of Holland, a supernaturalism tinged with rationalism may be said to have been the doctrinal system which claimed the suffrage of a majority of theologians at the close of the first quarter of the nineteenth century. While miracles were not denied, a vivid sense of the divine immanence was wanting, the immediate agency of the Holy Spirit upon the hearts of men received little recognition, and the dogmatic side of religion was estimated somewhat coldly. The practical side of Kant's philosophy was in good repute, but speculative philosophy of any kind evoked only moderate interest. In fine, the characteristics of the old supernaturalist school of Germany were widely illustrated.

At this stage a diversifying element was brought in by the zeal of a group of men in whom a patriotic appreciation for the past of the nation was joined with a somewhat positive confessional bent. The foremost spirits in the group were the poet Bilderdijk, Da Costa, Cappadose, and Groen van Prinsterer. With the con-

fessional phase of the movement which they patronized a pietistic came to be associated, the latter being fostered by the writings of prominent representatives of the revival movement in Switzerland and France. With the progress of the agitation dissatisfaction with the religious immobility and doctrinal laxity of the dominant party was sharpened to the degree that the more zealous and impatient broke their connection with the establishment. The schism began under the leadership of De Cock, whose severe strictures upon the church administration caused his deposition in 1834. The separatists, under the name of the Christian Reformed Church, had reached in the latter part of the century a membership of 140,000.

Since the rise of this free church the theological domain in the Reformed Church of Holland has been divided between diverse schools. The Rationalistic School, ably represented by Scholten and Kuenen, has been strongly intrenched at Leyden. Scholten retained little of the old Reformed creed, except its determinism. A theory of naturalistic evolution — denying, not the general superiority of the Old and the New Testament religions, but all supernatural agency in their rise — underlies the Biblical criticism of Kuenen. In the Groningen School, represented by Hofstede de Groot, Pareau, and Muurling, one may recognize the central features of Schleiermacher's theological system,— his emphasis upon the religious significance of the person of Christ, and also his negative attitude toward the historic doctrine of the Trinity.

The principles of a school which has been termed the Ethical-irenical have been voiced by La Saussaye. In

his ways of thinking he has points of likeness to the Mediatorial School in Germany. He concedes a high function to philosophy, and advocates the reconciliation of reason and faith. The juristic aspect of the Church has but a small place in his interest. In general, his standpoint is remote from ecclesiasticism. "The Church," he remarks, "of which our Lord said that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, is an entirely different thing from an institution or a body of institutions."¹ In the writings of Van Oosterzee the Reformed Theology is retained in its general outline, though softened in some points, much as it had been in the modified Edwardianism of the later New England theologians. A stanch champion of strict Reformed dogma has appeared in Kuyper. His views find considerable response in the middle and lower ranks, while the cultured incline largely to the standpoint of the Groningen or the Leyden School.

By the law of Holland, as passed in 1856, religious teaching is excluded from the public schools. The universities have theological faculties; but the provision for the chairs of dogmatics and practical theology is made, according to an act of 1876, from the church fund. The strict Calvinist party, preferring an institution more certain to represent their views, founded a new university at Amsterdam, which was opened in 1880.

The Scandinavian countries remained, both in law and in fact, well-nigh the exclusive domain of Lutheranism till the middle of the century. In Denmark, dissenters first obtained civil equality with the members of

¹ *La Crise Religieuse en Hollande*, 1860, p. 147.

the establishment in 1849. Norway legalized dissent in 1851. By the law of Sweden apostasy from Lutheranism was punishable with banishment till 1860, and full religious and civil privileges were not conceded to separatists till a decade later. With the abolition of restrictions upon outsiders some items of enlarged freedom were at the same time given to the lay element in the establishments. In 1868 Denmark passed a very democratic measure, allowing twenty families, located within specified limits, to select and support, without severing their connection with the State Church, a pastor of their own, in case they should be dissatisfied with the regular incumbent. The right of laymen to conduct devotional services has been conceded in Sweden and Norway. Under this free regime the Baptists and Methodists, in recent years, have made considerable progress in Sweden.

Among the Scandinavian writers of the period Grundtvig, Søren Kierkegaard, and Bishop Martensen, belonging to the Danish communion, have made distinctive contributions to religious literature. The first was a zealous foe of rationalism, an advocate of popular privilege, and a representative of patriotic feeling combined with lyric talent. His service to hymnology is his best title to remembrance. In his theological scheme he gave overwhelming stress to the Apostles' Creed, and adopted the uncritical view that this formula of belief was dictated by our Lord in the interval between His death and resurrection. Kierkegaard wrote treatises which reflect an intense subjective type of piety. Bishop Martensen ranks among the eminent representatives of the mediation theology. His writings indicate a genial,

speculative habit of mind, large sympathy with the mystical side of Christianity, and a somewhat friendly attitude toward theosophy. This last trait qualified him to be an appreciative biographer of Jacob Boehme.

Protestantism received a limited toleration under Austrian rule in the first half of the nineteenth century. Opposition to its legal standing was, however, so fierce in the Tyrolese province that in 1837 about four hundred converts to the Protestant faith were in a manner forced out of the country. They settled under Prussian auspices in Silesia. After 1848 larger freedom was given to dissenting bodies. The imperial patent of 1861 was especially liberal toward them, and evoked accordingly a strong opposition from the clerical party in Tyrol, who were fully persuaded that their soil ought to be forever sacred to Roman Catholicism. The formal abolition of the concordat with the Roman See in 1870 helped to secure the Protestants in the tranquil enjoyment of their religion. In point of numbers they constitute a respectable fraction of the population. Hungary, including the old province of Transylvania, has the majority of them, her Protestant inhabitants being reckoned at between three and four millions.

After three centuries of banishment by means of fagot and sword, Protestantism was allowed to obtain a slight foothold in Spain. The constitution of 1855 ordained that no Spaniard should be persecuted on account of his faith, so long as he should refrain from acts injurious to religion. Persecution was not indeed ended by the constitutional provision, as the earnest evangelists Ruet and Matamoros found. Still a measure of opportunity was given from this time for the

spread of Protestant teaching. In 1868 permission was granted for the building of a Protestant church at Madrid. The constitution of 1875 admitted the principle of tolerance, only limiting the public manifestation of non-Catholic religion to sanctuaries and cemeteries. Within a dozen years from this date Protestantism in Spain numbered some sixty congregations, with about fifteen thousand members.

The advancement of Protestantism in Italy has not yet begun to bear any true proportion to the dissatisfaction of the Italians with Roman Catholicism. A people which has been accustomed to relegate all religious problems to the priesthood, and to exercise no responsibility for its creed, does not easily rise to the plane of personal thoughtfulness and religious endeavor which are required by the very nature of Protestantism. Thus the evangelical leaven enters but slowly into the minds of the Italians. Protestants are still reckoned at only about twenty thousand. The time of opportunity, however, has been but brief, and would hardly suffice under very favorable conditions for more than foundation work. The Free Church, the Waldenses, and the societies formed by foreign missionary associations are the chief factors in the evangelical force. The first dates from the middle years of the century, and represents a rather extreme opposition to clericalism and ritualism. A work similar to the Old Catholic has its earnest exponents. By one agency or another a wide circulation is being given to the Bible. It is said that in 1890 more copies of the Scriptures were sold in Italy than of any other book.

CHAPTER II.

ROMANISM IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE SINCE THE FALL OF THE FIRST NAPOLEON.

I.—MEDIEVAL TENDENCIES IN THE SPHERE OF WORSHIP.

IN looking for events which may serve to indicate most clearly the cardinal developments of Romanism since the time of Napoleon I., one naturally fixes upon the declaration, in 1854, of the immaculate conception of the Virgin, the Vatican Council of 1869–70, the Syllabus of 1864, and the abrogation of the Pope's temporal power since the autumn of 1870. The first of these events may be regarded as the leading dogmatic expression of mediæval tendencies in the sphere of worship; the Vatican Council stands for Papal absolutism and infallibility; while the Syllabus and the overthrow of the temporal power have involved much discussion of ecclesiastico-political matters, or questions bearing on the relations of Church and State. These three topics, therefore, furnish the subdivisions of the present chapter.

The declaration of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary was a victory of sentimental worship; and it is principally in this aspect that we wish to consider the event. It is fitting, however, to notice briefly the character of that declaration as a dogmatic fiat. It was a sheer fiat, issued in virtual mockery of the grounds,

Scripture and unbroken tradition, which Romish theology professes to require for every dogma.

Where are the scriptural passages which intimate the immaculate conception of the Virgin? Behold a prodigy of eyesight! Pius IX. in his bull *Ineffabilis Deus* supports the dogma on Genesis iii. 15 and Luke i. 28, and theologians have added sentences from the Song of Solomon. Now the fathers, with all their exegetical aberrations, never twisted these scriptures into a proof of the immaculate conception. Defenders of the dogma may safely be challenged to cite a single authentic writing of the first eight centuries which gives this exposition.¹

Where is the warrant for the dogma in the records of tradition? Some of the early fathers, in a time of unbridled allegorizing, may have employed a rather

¹ It is hardly necessary for the opponent to take exception to spurious productions in this connection, for most of these which are imputed to the fathers do not interpret the Scriptures in favor of the immaculate conception of Mary, except to one who is determined to find that interpretation. It is proper, however, to note that certain homilies attributed to Origen, *Decem Homilia in Diversos*, are pronounced by eminent Roman Catholic critics to be spurious; also the Letters of Dionysius of Alexandria against Paul of Samosata, the work on the Annunciation attributed to Gregory Thaumaturgus, the Prayers to the Mother of God assigned to Ephrem, and the sermons given under the name of Epiphanius. How much of specifically Romish imagination is necessary in order to discover the doctrine promulgated by Pius IX. in any genuine comment of the fathers on the Scriptures may be learned by consulting the following: Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryphone, c. cii.; Irenæus, *Contra Hæreses*, iii. 22. 4, iii. 23. 7, iv. 40. 3, v. 19. 1; Tertullian, *De Cultu Fem.*, i. 6, *Adv. Marcionem*, ii. 10, *De Carne Christi*, xvii.; Cyprian, *Adv. Judæos*, ii. 9; Ambrose, *De Fuga Sæculi*, vi. n. 43, *De Paradiso*, x. n. 47; Jerome, *Heb. Quest. in Gen.* iii. 15; Augustine, *In Psal. xxxv.* 18, *xlviii.* 6, *ciii.* 6; Origen, *In Jer., Hom. xix.* 7, *In Luc., Hom. vi.*; Epiphanius, *Hæreses*, *Ixxviii.* §§ 18, 19; Chrysostom, *In Gen., cap. iii.*, *Hom. xvii.* 7.

florid rhetoric in description of the Virgin's office and dignity. In the fourth and the following centuries many writers doubtless bestowed high honors upon Mary. At a time when monasticism was lauded to the skies, and saint worship was being intruded into the place of the classic polytheism, enthusiastic veneration necessarily flowed toward the virgin mother. As virgin she satisfied the monastic ideal; while as mother — *Mother of God*, to use the orthodox shibboleth of the fifth century — she was brought into a divine relation which seemed to exalt her far above all other mortals. What wonder that, under this double aspect, her purity and unique elevation should frequently have been celebrated in warmly colored sentences! It is not the slightest occasion for surprise to find one and another writer speaking of her as *immaculate*. But it is to be noted that *immaculate* is one thing and *immaculate conception* is another. In no instance were the two words conjoined by the fathers in the sense of the dogma of 1854. The adjective was used to denote either the unsullied virginity of Mary, or a purity resulting from special grace bestowed after conception. Some of the very writers who speak of the *immaculate* Virgin, or who lavish upon her the most extravagant honors, unmistakably deny her *immaculate conception*. Fathers of the highest authority are involved in this denial, as well as nearly the whole list of illustrious scholastics, though these same scholastics pushed the veneration of the Virgin across the verge of an ill-disguised idolatry. In consideration of these facts, he who quotes in proof of the recently declared dogma any patristic sentence which indicates only a worshipful attitude toward the Virgin, or an enthusiastic

regard for her purity, simply proclaims his incompetency for an honest and scientific review of history. Apologists, indeed, would have done well had they forbore historical references, and contented themselves with the point of view taken in the fifteenth century by Gerson, who spoke of the doctrine of the immaculate conception as *newly revealed*. In fact, Duns Scotus, who wrote at the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century, was the first notable champion of the doctrine, and he based it on speculative, not historical, grounds.¹ It was with no small show of prudence, ac-

¹ Several of the fathers use language which is so far from predicating entire sinlessness of Mary that it might be understood as not excusing her from such actual sins as over-anxiety, ambition, or lack of faith. Here belong Irenaeus, *Contra Hær.*, iii. 16. 7; Origen, *In Luc.*, Hom. xvii.; Chrysostom, *In Joannem*, Hom. xxi.; Basil, *Epist.* cclx. n. 9; Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joan.*, lib. xii. cap. xix. ver. 25. Add to such passages those which implicitly or explicitly reject the immaculate conception, and the result is a complete historic negation of the doctrine. Justin Martyr shows that he had no desire to exempt Mary from original sin by styling Christ "the only spotless and sinless" one (*Dial. cum Tryph.*, cx.). Tertullian indicates the like standpoint in this terse declaration : Solus enim Deus sine peccato, et solus homo sine peccato Christus, quia et Deus Christus (*De Anima*, xli.). Origen says, Solus vero Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui peccatum nescit, neque in patre, neque in matre contaminatus est (*In Levit.*, Hom. xii. n. 4). Ambrose writes to the same effect, Solus enim per omnia ex natis de femina sanctus Dominus Jesus, qui terrenæ contagia corruptelæ immaculati partus novitate non senserit et cœlesti majestate depulerit (*In Luc.*, lib. ii. n. 56). Augustine asserts repeatedly, in the most explicit terms, that Christ alone of the race was or could be exempt from original sin: Solus sine peccato natus est, quem sine virili complexu, non concupiscentia carnis, sed obedientia mentis virgo concepit (*De Peccat. Merit.*, i. 57). Solus ergo ille etiam homo factus manens Deus, peccatum nullum habuit unquam, nec sumpsit carnem peccati, quamvis de materna carne peccati: quod enim carnis inde suscepit, id profecto aut suscipiendo mundavit, aut suscipiendo mun-

cordingly, that Perrone and others have recurred to Belarmin's test of valid tradition and have laid down the

davit (*Ibid.* ii. 38). Teneamus ergo indeclinabilem fidei confessionem : Solus unus est qui sine peccato natus est in similitudine carnis peccati (*Ibid.* ii. 57). Ephrem the Syrian says, "Christ was born of a nature which had not been exempted from corruptions, and which needed to be purified by His visitation" (*Margarita Pretiosa*). John of Damascus is equally clear as to the need of purification. "After the consent of the Holy Virgin," he says, "the Holy Ghost came upon her, according to the word of the Lord which the angel spoke, and purified her" (*De Fid. Orth.*, iii. 2). Paschasius Radbertus formally excluded the notion of the immaculate conception by teaching, like many others, that Mary needed and received purification in the womb of her mother : At vero beata Maria, licet ipsa de carne peccati sit nata et procreata, ipsaque quamvis caro peccati fuerit, non tunc jam quando, præveniente Spiritus Sancti gratia, ab angelo præ omnibus mulieribus benedicta vocatur. Alioquin si non eodem Spiritu Sancto sanctificata est et emundata, quo modo caro ejus non caro peccati fuit ? . . . Sic et beata virgo Maria, nisi in utero matris sanctificata esset, minime nativitas ejus colenda esset. (*De Partu Virg.*, lib. i.) Damiani corrects the impression, which might come from some rhetorical expressions of his, by this unequivocal sentence : Quandoquidem et ipse Dei mediator, et hominum, de peccatoribus originem duxit, et de fermentata massa sinceritatis azymam absque ulla vetustatis infectione suscepit ; imo, ut expressius dicam, ex ipsa carne virginis, quæ de peccato concepta est, caro sine peccato produxit, quæ ultro etiam carnis peccata delevit. (*Liber Gratissimus*, xix.) Anselm of Canterbury indicates unmistakably his belief that the Virgin was conceived in sin : In peccatis concepit eam mater ejus, et cum originali peccato nata est, quoniam et ipsa in Adam peccavit in quo omnes peccaverunt (*Cur Deus Homo*, ii. 16). The tenor of Bernard's criticism upon the celebration of the feast of Mary's conception, as instituted by the canons of Lyons, shows with sufficient distinctness his conviction that the Virgin was not exempt from the common lot of the race as respects original sin. (*Epist. clxxiv.*) Thomas Aquinas denied the immaculate conception in these plain terms : Beata Virgo contraxit originale peccatum, sed ab eo fuit mundata, antequam ex utero nasceretur (*Sum. Theol.*, iii. 27. 2). Bonaventura was equally definite. In his commentary on the Third Book of Sentences, he wrote : An caro Virginis sanctificata fuerit ante animationem ? Gloriæ Virginis caro

canon that what commands the general assent of the Church in the present must always have been at least implicitly believed by it, and so must rest back on apostolic teaching.¹ A rule of this sort is convenient; but any one ought to see that it is transparent hypocrisy to pretend that tradition is a real authority where such a rule prevails. On this basis the simple fact that a thing is believed proves its historic right to be believed, and investigation is made a superfluous, if not an unholy task.

ante animationem non fuit sanctificata, cum sanctificatio per aliquod superadditum donum fieri debeat, quod non in carne, sed in anima recipitur. — An Anima beatæ Virginis sanctificata fuerit ante originalis peccati contractionem? Quod gloriose Virginis sanctificatio fuerit post peccati originalis contractionem, pietati fidei magis consonat et sanctorum auctoritati magis concordat. (Dist. iii. p. i. art. 1. q. 1 et 2, quoted by A. Stap, *L'Immaculée Conception*, 1869.) In fine, as noted above, it was the standard scholastic teaching till the time of Duns Scotus that Mary was conceived in original sin. Melchior Cano had the warrant of indubitable facts when he wrote in the sixteenth century: *Sancti omnes, qui in ejus rei mentionem incidere, uno ore asseverarunt, beatam Virginem in peccato originali conceptam* (*Loci Theol.*, vii. 1). The authority of Duns Scotus, however, was decisive with the Franciscans, and an increasing party after his day advocated the immaculate conception. The Dominicans, indeed, kept up a stubborn opposition for centuries; but when the Jesuits were added to the lists of the Immaculists, there was no obstacle sufficient to prevent the speculation of Duns Scotus from being enthroned.

How an honest and critical mind might despair of finding a suitable historic ground for the dogma proclaimed by Pius IX. was illustrated as late as 1870 by Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis, who declared that he had never been able to find where the doctrine was taught, either in the Scriptures or in the writings of the fathers: *Istam sententiam ad depositum fidei pertinere non nego; quam tamen inibi, quale illud Scriptura et Patrum scripta exhibent invenire nunquam potui; nec unquam quemdam nactus sum, qui eam inibi contineri mihi ostendere possit.* (*Concio in Conc. Vat. Habenda at non Habita*, p. 43.)

¹ J. Perrone, *De Immaculata B. V. Mariæ Conceptu, an Dogmatico Decreto definiri possit.*

The appeal which has been made to the feast of Mary's conception is found entirely useless for the purpose in behalf of which it has been cited. The early Church had no such feast,—no feast even in honor of Mary's nativity, as appears from the testimony of Augustine that only the nativities of Christ and John the Baptist were celebrated by the Church in his day.¹ Even in the twelfth century Bernard of Clairvaux stigmatized the feast of the conception as a superstitious innovation, for which pontifical authority was wanting. It is true that the feast may have obtained some recognition in Spain as early as the tenth century, and in the Greek Church as early as the eighth. But it is to be noted that what the Greeks celebrated was God's grace in granting a daughter to Anna and Joachim. In the liturgical books of the East the feast is named the *Conception of Saint Anna*. It commemorated therefore the fact of Mary's being conceived, and had no reference to her supposed exemption from original sin, any more than the contemporary feast of John the Baptist implied that he was immaculately conceived. Nor is it proved that the feast had any different significance in the West in the earlier period of its celebration there. Indeed, it was not made distinctly a feast of the *immaculate conception* till a much later date, so that Muratori in the eighteenth century could declare that its celebration might be continued, though it should be authoritatively proclaimed that Mary was not immaculately conceived.

The bull of Pius IX., besides quoting Scripture, alleging unbroken tradition, and appealing to the feast of the conception, says that the Church of Rome — that is,

¹ Serm. ccxc. n. 2.

more especially, the Popes — has had nothing more at heart than to profess, sustain, propagate, and defend the doctrine of the immaculate conception. In this last statement the Pope, whose scanty learning was in general a poor safeguard against the arts of special pleaders, was as far from historic ground as in the foregoing specifications. In the list of Roman pontiffs, Sixtus IV., at the end of the fifteenth century, was the first conspicuous patron of the immaculate conception. Innocent III. had used language distinctly implying that Mary was conceived in original sin.¹ Innocent V. expressed the same conclusion in the most direct and explicit terms.² Gregory XV. in 1622 declared, in response to a request for a decree in favor of the immaculate conception, that the Eternal Wisdom had not yet revealed this mystery to the Church, — *nondum æterna sapientia ecclesiæ suæ tanti mysterii penetralia patefecit.* The revelation, then, if we are to believe Gregory XV., must have come since his pontificate, or not at all. Possibly Pius IX. may have been favored, before the year 1854, with as unmistakable a revelation as that which Bernadette Soubirous received a little later, at the grotto of Lourdes, when the mysterious apparition, after repeated communications, finally declared her identity in the words, “I

¹ *Statim Spiritus Sanctus supervenit in eam ; prius quidem in eam venerat, cum in utero matris animam ejus ab originali peccato mundavit, sed et nunc supervenit in eam ut carnem ejus a fomite peccati mundaret, quantum esset sine ruga prorsus et macula* (*Serm. in Solemnitate Purificat. Virginis, Opera, Migne, iv. 506*). Contrasting Eve and Mary he says : *Illa fuit sine culpa producta, sed produxit in culpam ; hæc autem fuit in culpa producta, sed sine culpa produxit* (*Serm. in Solem. Assumptionis Virginis*).

² In III. Sent., dist. 3, quoted by Stap, *L'Immaculée Conception*, p. 13.

am the Immaculate Conception.”¹ In this case, however, it would have been to his credit to have expressed his reliance upon the vision, and not to have published a bull which is a complete caricature of history.

The close relation of the new dogma to sentimental devotion is evinced by a great mass of utterances from popes, bishops, and priests, as well as by a series of popular demonstrations. The Middle Ages were in fact outdone. In the encyclical addressed by Pius IX. to the bishops in 1849, asking their opinion on the proposed definition of the immaculate conception, the Pope says: “You know very well, venerable brethren, that the whole of our confidence is placed in the most holy Virgin, since God has placed in Mary the fulness of all good, that accordingly we may know that if there is any hope in us, if any grace, if any salvation, it redounds to us from her, because such is His will who hath willed that we should have everything through Mary.”² The responses of many of the bishops were in a like vein. The Archbishop of Grenada wrote respecting the Virgin: “She loves those who love her, and most abundantly builds up with graces, and disposes her servants to become the habitation and temple of her Blessed Son and the Holy Spirit. She was full of grace, that of her fulness all creatures may receive, and have a large shower of heavenly gifts infused into them. She is the mother of fair love, and fear, and knowledge, and holy hope, and in her is all grace of the way and of truth, all hope

¹ Lasserre, *Our Lady of Lourdes*, p. 216. This part of the story is fully as convincing as the accounts of moving and blood-sweating images which were employed against the Reformers in the sixteenth century.

² Pusey’s Version, *Eirenicon*, pp. 122, 123.

of life and virtue.”¹ “All heresies,” said the Bishop of Firenza, “in the whole world were slain by her; she is terrible as an ordered host to protect the universal Church of her Only Begotten Son, and to put its enemies to flight; in her is all hope of life and virtue.” A number of the bishops referred to Mary as “Co-Redeemer,” or “Co-Redemptrix.” In the decree which contained the papal definition Pius IX. speaks of Mary as “the most powerful mediatrix, who ever slew all heresies and delivered the faithful people and nations from the greatest calamities of all sorts.” “Nothing,” he adds, “is to be feared, nothing despaired of, when she is captain; she the author, she propitious, she protecting, who, bearing a motherly mind towards us, and having in hand the affairs of our salvation, is anxious about the whole human race, and having been made by the Lord Queen of heaven and earth, and exalted above all the orders of angels and saints, standing at the right hand of her only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, does by her mother’s prayers most potently impetrare, and finds what she seeks, and cannot be frustrated.”

A few years after the promulgation of the dogma, in a work devoted to its defence by the Bishop of Bruges, we have such declarations as these: “The Mother of the Messiah has been assimilated in all respects to her Son. The Catholic Church teaches by the mouth of the holy fathers that Mary has possessed, by an effect of grace, all the gifts, all the privileges, which her Divine Son has possessed by the rights of His nature. The perfect identity of thoughts, of sentiments, of action, and of mission, which exists between the Messiah and His

¹ Quoted by Pusey.

holy mother, supposes that the enmities of Mary toward the serpent equal in all respects the enmities of her Son toward the serpent, and even that these enmities are identical in the Son and in the mother. . . . Mary appears associated with the Son as Co-Redemptrix of the human race. . . . One understands now with what justice the Holy Spirit could speak of the origin of Mary, when He revealed the eternal origin of the Word, and with how good right the Church has been able to apply to Mary the words of Scripture which concern the birth of the Divine Wisdom. When understood of the conception of the Mother of God, there is no longer any obscurity in these words, ‘The Lord possessed me at the beginning of His ways, before that He created aught.’ Mary is presented here as the first of creatures. . . . This primogeniture supposes in Mary a superiority, in some sort eternal and wholly celestial, which assimilates her to the Son of God. . . . Between Mary and God there is no middle course.”¹

In assigning to Mary a peculiar association or an identity with the Divine Wisdom, the Bishop of Bruges does not stand alone. Leo XIII. in an encyclical of the year 1879 uses this language: “Let us employ with God the most efficacious patronage of the Blessed Virgin Mary, who is called the Seat of Wisdom.”² In general Pope Leo has betrayed an equal desire with his predecessor to enlist Mary for the defence of the Church, and the salvation of the race. An encyclical was issued by

¹ Bishop Malou, *L’Immaculée Conception de la B. V. Marie, considérée comme Dogma de Foi*, 1857, tom i. pp. 176, 313, 318–321, 344, quoted by Stap.

² *Life and Letters of Leo XIII.*, edited by J. F. Talbot.

him in 1883 for the commendation of that form of prayer which is known as the rosary. In this letter, speaking of defending the rights of the Church, he says: "To that end we consider that no means could be more efficacious and more certain than our gaining, by the religious practice of the veneration due to her, the favor of the sublime Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, sovereign depositary of all peace, and dispenser of all grace, who has been placed by her Divine Son at the summit of glory and power, in order that with her protection she might aid mankind, on its way of weariness and peril, towards the City of Eternity. It has always been the principal and most solemn care of Catholics to take refuge under the ægis of Mary, and to appeal to her motherly goodness in troubled times and its conditions of peril. This proves that the Catholic Church has always placed, and with reason, her hope and confidence in the Mother of God."

While thus popes and bishops were exalting Mary to the plane of practical divinity, it might be expected that those who felt less the check of official responsibility would not fall behind in expressing their devotion. Some have written in favor of a real presence of Mary in the eucharist. Faber affiliates with this view in expressing the notion that a part of the host is capable of being identified as having once belonged to the substance of Mary. For the rest, Faber gives a loose rein to sentimentality, and runs here and there into extravagances which cancel all æsthetic impression. Instead of the simple and pure woman presented to us in the Gospels, or even in the paintings of Raphael, we are offered a pious monstrosity. Think of the devotional

disorder which must have come over a man gifted with not a little of poetic sensibility before he could wish to quote, in description of the sorrow of the Virgin, this gross mathematical calculation: "Saint Bernardine of Siena says that so great was the dolor of the blessed Virgin that if it was subdivided and parcelled out among all creatures capable of suffering, they would perish instantly."¹ Equal offences against taste and moderation might be cited. Under the stimulus of such literature, the worship of the Virgin must cease to have even that much of good effect which comes from the contemplation of a pure, womanly ideal. What is really given in these devotional effusions is the picture of a woman enlarged to the proportions of an unnatural divinity.

With the progress of this modern Mariolatry the French appear to have evinced a special aptitude for seeing the Virgin. Various places have boasted of her visitations, and the merits of different shrines have been extolled, as if they stood for different and rival goddesses. In 1846 two shepherd children claimed to have seen a beautiful woman surrounded by a bright radiance, upon the mountain of De la Salette in Dauphiny, and in 1858 a peasant girl, who had a share of Swedenborgian faculty, was the subject of special visitations at Lourdes in the Pyrenees. The scenes of these visions became the more favored shrines. Monster processions were gotten up in honor of the Virgin. The clergy industriously promoted these manifestations of zeal, so that a visitor from the most orthodox portions of Spanish America might be led to think that French

¹ F. W. Faber, *The Foot of the Cross, or the Sorrows of Mary.*

civilization and religion were reaching toward the ideal exemplified in his country.

The Jesuits have been credited with a principal share in the fostering of idolatrous and eccentric devotion.¹ And in truth their record tends to support the allegation. From the time that they began to promote the worship of the Sacred Heart, they have given abundant indications that they know well how to value a blind devotion which swamps all criticism.

As the connection of Mary with the person of the Redeemer afforded the historic ground upon which mingled sentimentality and speculation have built up her practical deification, so the connection of Joseph with Mary has supplied a ground for the exaltation of the former, and a special inclination to build upon this ground has been manifested recently. Pius IX. evinced his desire to promote the commemoration of Mary's spouse, and proclaimed him patron of the Church. Leo XIII. has responded cordially to the action of his predecessor. In the list of celestial patrons customarily appealed to at the close of his encyclicals, Joseph occupies a place of honor between Mary and the apostles Peter and Paul. Thus in his first encyclical he exhorts his episcopal brethren to seek the peace of the Church, "through the intercession of the Immaculate Queen of Heaven, of Saint Joseph, patron of the Church, and of the holy princes of the apostles, Peter and Paul."²

¹ Toutes les dévotions nouvelles et excentriques ont eu pour auteurs les Jésuites ou les affiliés qui suivaient leurs inspirations. (Guettée, *Histoire des Jésuites*, iii. 405.)

² Can any one, who is acquainted with the New Testament, believe that the apostles would recognize this strange dialect?

He also speaks of Joseph as "the most pure spouse of the Virgin,"¹ and as "the heavenly patron of the Catholic Church."²

The next thing in order would seem to be the declaration of the immaculate conception of Joseph. And in fact the movement has already been initiated, though it be in a rather obscure way. A book which was translated from the Dutch, and published in 1869, advocates the immaculate conception and assumption of Saint Joseph.³ Little of visible progress may have been made since this pioneer introduced the subject. But suppose a new Duns Scotus should rise up and should press for faith in the immaculate conception of Joseph, why might not the matter reach an authoritative definition in some future age? To be sure, all the preceding centuries have been silent so far as any direct reference to the subject is concerned. But this is not necessarily accounted a fatal objection. From the silence of the first two centuries on the immaculate conception of the Virgin, Lambruschini argues that the Church in that era accepted it with entire unanimity.⁴ Why may not some future apologist construe silence similarly in favor of Joseph's exemption from original sin? A profitable appeal could also be made to some statements which might be regarded as implicitly containing the doctrine which they do not assert explicitly. For example, Leo XIII., as was noticed above, styles Joseph the *most pure* spouse of Mary. But how, it may be argued, can this superlative be applicable, if there was ever any taint of original

¹ Bull of August 4, 1879.

² Encyc. of 1884.

³ Friedrich, Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils, i. 626.

⁴ Sull' Immacolato Concepimento di Maria, pp. 46, 47.

sin in Joseph? In fine, the intrinsic historical objections to defining the immaculate conception of Joseph would not be found a whit greater than those standing against the decree of 1854 in behalf of the Virgin. All that would be necessary would be the assent of the Pope, and of the majority which his patronage could easily secure. This much gained, the revised theory of tradition would apply, and the majority vote could be taken as an unmistakable token that the doctrine of Joseph's immaculate conception is based on apostolic teaching, and is part and parcel of the deposit of the faith.

An advance of sentimental devotion like that which has been sketched meant of course a prodigal strewing of incense before the Pope. In 1866 the Bishop of Bordeaux spoke of the Pope as "the centre of the divine government and the living incarnation of the authority of Christ."¹ Strong as is this statement, it rather yields the palm to that which Pius IX. uttered of himself in the same year. If the Ultramontane papers of France can be trusted, the Pope said: "Despite my unworthiness, I alone am the successor of the apostles, the vicar of Jesus Christ, I alone have the mission to guide and direct the barque of Peter, I am the way, the truth, and the life."² Another expression, attributed to the Pope by no hostile hand, indicates a pronounced conviction that it was a part of his function to be the death of men as well as their life. Referring to excommunications

¹ Le centre du gouvernement divin, et l'incarnation vivante de l'autorité du Christ. (Quoted by Friedrich, Vat. Kouzil, i. 499.)

² Seul, malgré mon indignité, je suis le successeur des Apôtres, le Vicaire de Jésus-Christ, seul j'ai la mission de conduire et de diriger la barque de Pierre, je suis la voie, la vérité et la vie. (Ibid., i. 498.)

visited upon those who had invaded the States of the Church and secured their annexation to the kingdom of Italy, he said: "True, I cannot, like Saint Peter, hurl certain thunders which turn bodies to ashes; nevertheless, I can hurl thunders which turn souls to ashes. And I have done it by excommunicating all those who perpetrated the sacrilegious spoliation, or had a hand in it."¹

An article of the *Civiltà Cattolica* in 1867 teaches, respecting the relation of the people to the Pope, that "it is necessary for them to understand that from him they derive their faith, from him their religious life, and that he is the dispenser of spiritual graces."² In an article of the same journal, in the following year, it is said: "The treasures of revelation, treasures of truth, treasures of justice, treasures of spiritual gifts, have been deposited upon earth in the hands of one man, who is the sole dispenser and custodian of them. . . . This man is the Pope."³ An equivalent statement, written just before the declaration of infallibility, is given in the following: "Christ is the voice of the Father, and the Pontiff is the voice of Christ. The Father in the fulness of time spake unto us by His Son. The Son, after His return to the Father, continues to speak to us by His Vicar. . . . Affirming the infallibility of the Pontiff, therefore, means no less than affirming the duration of the reign of Christ upon earth."⁴ In harmony with this sentiment, the oppo-

¹ *Discorsi*, i. 158, quoted by William Arthur, *The Pope, the Kings, and the People*, i. 40, 41.

² Original in Janus, p. 41.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

⁴ Quoted by Arthur, *The Pope, the Kings, and the People*, ii. 357.

nents of infallibility in the council are styled New Arians,—impugners of the divinity resident in the Pope. Veuillot, the Pope's lay shouter in France, did not shun to utter such sentences as these: "The Pope is, like Jesus Christ, the absolute ruler of consciences and sceptres; Jesus Christ, sovereign master of all things, resides in the Pope, not only by the title of pontiff, but still further by that of king of kings."¹ Others also compassed the incredible by calling the Pope the "Holy Spirit" or "the Eucharist." Gratry, to whom such expressions seemed sheer madness, narrates: "Is it not to myself that a priest, a man very pious, very zealous, very well informed, said and repeated these words, Yes, there is upon the earth a man who can say, 'I am the Holy Spirit'? It is to myself that a most honorable Catholic writer, after a discussion upon this point, wrote a long letter to maintain, as pious and true, this proposition: 'The Pope is the Eucharist.'"² The meaning of this last expression, notwithstanding its singularity, is sufficiently obvious: it denotes that the Pope, like the eucharistic elements, is the visible shrine of the most holy presence of the God-man. Faber—whose special function seems to have been to carry the Oxford movement to a *reductio ad absurdum*, through the complete sacrifice of reason to a sentimental and materialized devotion—adopts this view. "The Pope," he says, "is for us in our whole

¹ Le pape est, de par Jésus-Christ, le dominateur absolu des consciences et des sceptres; Jésus-Christ, maître souverain de toutes choses, réside dans le pape, non-seulement à titre de pontife, mais encore à titre de roi des rois. (Friedrich, I. 500.)

² Third Letter to Deschamps.

conduct that which the Holy Sacrament is for our adorations. The mystery of his office as Vicar resembles the mystery of the Holy Sacrament: the two mysteries are intertwined, so to say, one with the other.” He adds: “One might as well try to be a good Christian without devotion to the blessed Virgin, as without devotion to the Pope. The devotion to the Pope is an essential part of Christian piety, an indispensable element of all Christian holiness.”¹ Even Cardinal Manning, though writing under conditions which dictated caution and moderation, has subscribed to the view that all true history is absorbed in the record of the popes. “I am not afraid of defending,” he wrote, “the condensed statement of Donoso Cortes: ‘The history of civilization is the history of Christianity; the history of Christianity is the history of the Church; the history of the Church is the history of the pontiffs.’”² When men of note speak with so little restraint, a measure of extravagance can easily be pardoned in the ordinary biographer. We read therefore with a good degree of complacency, in a Life of Leo XIII., that the lamp in the Pope’s study “gives forth that supernal light which illuminates both hemispheres.”

In the line of recent pageants for expressing the worshipful eminence of the Pope, none perhaps has excelled the ceremony of professing obedience at the Vatican Council, in which the cardinals kissed the hand of the Pope; the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, after a low obeisance, kissed his right knee; and the abbots, after kneeling, kissed his foot. The scene might

¹ Quoted by Gratry, Third Letter.

² The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance, p. 132.

have provoked the envy of Caligula, Domitian, and others of the old Roman emperors who received divine honors before their death. When we reflect that this was only a more signal specimen among a throng of kindred displays, we can easily accept the words of the Spanish statesman Castelar when he says, "All this universal homage was only too sure to foster in the Pope's mind the conceit of his being, not only a singular and privileged mortal, but a very God upon earth."¹

It should be noticed that the intemperate fostering of a materialistic worship was tributary to a schismatic movement in Germany. In 1844 more than a million pilgrims are said to have visited Treves, for the purpose of gazing on the "holy coat," — a garment reputed to have been made by the Virgin, and to have had a miraculous capacity for enlargement, so as to increase with the growth of the child Jesus. The scandal of this gigantic foolery, acting with other causes of discontent, contributed to the rise of a party called "German Catholics." Their professed aim was to exemplify a rational and apostolic type of Christianity, in which the priestly and ceremonial elements of Romanism should very largely be discarded. One wing of the party was inclined to Unitarian views. The revolutionary agitations of 1848 contributed to the progress of the German Catholics. But their lack of competent leadership and their doctrinal vagueness were not favorable to continued growth. The movement at its acme numbered about sixty thousand adherents.²

In recounting the facts of the present section we have

¹ Quoted by Galenga, *the Pope and The King*, II. 283.

² Baur, *Kirchengeschichte*, V. 308-326.

written an introduction to the following. Sentimental devotion, overriding all critical bent, prepared the way for the assertion of papal absolutism and infallibility. The apostles of the one were also the apostles of the other. Moreover, the Pope took advantage of the sentimental current virtually to commit the Church to the high Ultramontane theory. In decreeing by his sole authority the *immaculate conception* as an article of faith he proclaimed the relative uselessness of councils and the monopoly by himself of the infallibility which belongs to the Church. Papal partisans understood this bearing of the decree, and one of them wrote, in 1859: "By exercising his infallible authority in this solemn judgment, the sovereign pontiff has inflicted a mortal blow upon the Gallican opinions."¹

The high pressure of sentimental devotion may be regarded as having reached its acme in the pontificate of Pius IX. It must be acknowledged, nevertheless, that no preceding Pope has rendered in his public utterances a larger tribute to the Virgin and the saints than appears in the encyclicals of Leo XIII.

II.—PAPAL ABSOLUTISM AND INFALLIBILITY.

Human language was never made to yield a more complete expression of absolutism than that which was proclaimed at the Vatican Council in 1870. Not only was it declared that the voice of the Pope is the voice of God, when he speaks *ex cathedra* on questions of faith and morals, but all right of exception to administrative

¹ Bishop Malou, L'Immac. Concept., quoted by Stap, p. 302.

acts of the Pope was excluded under pain of anathema. The words of the decree unmistakably imply that the Pope is the superior bishop in every diocese, with a power of interference entirely unfettered by the local prelate ; the head of the Church in every nation, with a right of direct communication to the faithful which does not depend on the grant of the secular power and cannot justly be impeded thereby ; the unrestricted governor of the Church universal, from whose decision no appeal is allowed to any tribunal whatever. That this representation of the subject is not in the least overdrawn will appear from the following extracts : —

“ We teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman Church possesses a superiority of ordinary power over all other churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate ; to which all, of whatever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, to submit not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world, so that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme pastor through the preservation of unity both of communion and of profession of the same faith with the Roman pontiff. This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation.”

“ From this supreme power possessed by the Roman pontiff of governing the universal Church, it follows that he has the right of free communication with the pastors

of the whole Church, and with their flocks, that these may be taught and ruled by him in the way of salvation. Wherefore we condemn and reject the opinions of those who hold that the communication between the supreme head and the pastors and their flocks can lawfully be impeded ; or who make this communication subject to the will of the secular power, so as to maintain that whatever is done by the Apostolic See for the government of the Church cannot have force or value unless it be confirmed by the assent of the secular power.”

“ And since by the divine right of apostolic primacy the Roman pontiff is placed over the universal Church, we further teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful, and that in all causes the decision of which belongs to the Church recourse may be had to his tribunal, and that none may reopen the judgment of the Apostolic See, than whose authority there is no greater, nor can any lawfully review its judgment. Wherefore they err from the right course who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman pontiffs to an ecumenical council, as to an authority higher than that of the Roman pontiff.”

“ If, then, any shall say that the Roman pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, not only in things which belong to faith and morals, but also in those which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world ; or assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not all the fulness of this supreme power ; or that this power which he enjoys is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and all the churches, and over

each and all the pastors and the faithful: let him be anathema.”¹

If the Vatican decrees had stopped at this point, without saying an explicit word on the subject of infallibility, they would still have made obedience to the Pope the centre of the Roman Catholic religion, and would have left the whole body of believers absolutely without constitutional resource against any Papal mandate. As to infallibility, too, it is evidently contained in the language already quoted. A supreme power of jurisdiction, vested indivisibly in the Pope, and extending over faith and morals, as well as over matters of discipline and government, implies of necessity, on the Romish theory of the infallibility of the Church, the dogmatic infallibility of the Pope. The decree on this subject therefore merely expressed formally what had already been assumed in the foregoing chapter. The wording of the decree is on this wise: “We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed; that the Roman pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith and morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman pontiff

¹ Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Chap. III., On the Power and Nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff. It is worth observing that the tremendous canon which closes the chapter was introduced to the council in an irregular manner, and in its existing form was never submitted to discussion.

are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church. But if any one — which may God avert — presume to contradict this our definition: let him be anathema."

Roman Catholics very naturally are inclined to spurn references to the *apotheosis* of the Pope at the Vatican Council. But in all candor it may be asked, What practical difference would it have made in the Pope's authority if it had been decreed that he possesses divine attributes? His commands are entitled to universal obedience. He can require assent to them in conscience as well as in outward act; for he can proclaim with authority not to be challenged such moral principles as are agreeable to his commands; yea, it lies within his discretion to place the legitimacy of any particular command beyond all question, by explicitly declaring that it is conformable to this or that moral truth. A declaration of this kind would quite as clearly involve a dogmatic fact as a declaration, for example, that a proposition in a book had been condemned in the sense of the author. But infallibility, according to the exposition of its champions, extends to dogmatic facts. With very little circumlocution, therefore, the Pope can give the sanction of infallibility to any command, or stamp it with the attributes of a holiness which no subject of his can deny without denying the acknowledged foundation of his Church.¹

¹ According to a distinguished contributor to the *Civiltà Cattolica*, it is not even necessary that the Pope should formally declare that a matter lies in the sphere of morals. Its place in that sphere is evinced by the simple fact of the Pope's approbation or disapprobation. The true mode of arguing is as follows: Il Pontefice ha solo diritto decidere nell' ordine morale; ma egli ha deciso intorno a tali e tali proposizioni; dunque esse appartengono all' ordine morale. (*Liberatore, La Chiesa e lo Stato*, p. 286.)

What greater prerogatives could the Pope enjoy, in the way of authority, if it were distinctly asserted that he is endowed with omniscience and perfect holiness?

What has been said may serve to illustrate the breadth of meaning belonging to the words which have been placed at the head of the present section. It will now be our task to follow the path by which this all-devouring monarchy of the Pope was reached, or elevated to the rank of a dogma.

In the early part of the nineteenth century there were broad areas in the Romish Church where the Vatican theories, just described, were ignored or disclaimed. Those theories were essentially foreign at that date to England, Ireland, and the United States. In a treatise entitled "Roman Catholic Principles in Reference to God and the King," which reached thirty-five editions between 1748 and 1813, this language is used: "It is no matter of faith to believe that the Pope is in himself infallible, separated from the Church, even in expounding the faith; by consequence papal definitions or decrees, in whatever form pronounced, taken exclusively from [or apart from] a general council, or universal acceptance of the Church, oblige none under pain of heresy to an interior assent."¹ In 1822 Bishop Baines wrote: "Bellarmin and some other divines, chiefly Italians, have believed the Pope infallible, when proposing *ex cathedra* an article of faith. But in England or Ireland I do not believe that any Catholic maintains the infallibility of the Pope."² As Bishop Doyle, on the eve of Roman Catholic emancipation in England, was asked by a committee of the Eng-

¹ Quoted by Kenrick, *Concio in Conc. Vat. Habenda at non Habita.*

² Gladstone, *Vaticanism*, p. 48.

lish government whether the Catholic clergy insist that all the bulls of the Pope are entitled to obedience, he replied: "By no means. The Pope we consider as the executive authority of the Catholic Church; and when he issues a bull, enforcing a discipline already settled by a general council, such bull is entitled to respect. But he may issue bulls which would regard local discipline or other matters not already defined, and in that case his bull would be treated by us in such manner as it might seem good to us."¹ Archbishop Murray, being also questioned by the committee, gave this response as respects the doctrinal authority of the Roman pontiff: "A decree of the Pope in matters of doctrine is not considered binding on Catholics, if it have not the consent of the whole Church, either dispersed, or assembled by its bishops in council."² In Keenan's Catechism, which was used extensively in Great Britain and America, and which reached in 1870 its twenty-fourth edition, papal infallibility was treated in this manner: "*Quest.* Must not Catholics believe the Pope in himself to be infallible? *Ans.* This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic faith; no decision of his can oblige, under pain of heresy, unless it be received and enforced by the teaching body,—that is, by the bishops of the Church."³ Newman's conviction respecting the facts seems to have been in full accord with this documentary evidence. "As to the language of the bishops in 1826," he wrote, "we must recollect that at that time the clergy, both of Ireland and England, were educated in Gallican opinions. They took

¹ Kenrick, *Concio.*

² *Ibid.*

³ Gladstone, *Vaticanism*, p. 125.

those opinions for granted, and they thought, if they went so far as to ask themselves the question, that the definition of papal infallibility was simply impossible. Even among those at the Vatican Council, who themselves personally believed in it, I believe there were bishops who, until the actual definition had been passed, thought that such a definition could not be made."¹ The testimony of Cardinal Manning may also be quoted with some measure of pertinency. While disposed in general to estimate the amount of Gallicanism in the Church at a very contemptible figure, he allowed, in 1869, the fact of a formidable denial of infallibility which had generated "extensive doubt" as to the truth of the doctrine.² Up to the year of Roman Catholic emancipation (1829) Ultramontane teaching did not show its head in England or Ireland. It must be allowed, however, that it had its partisans very soon after that date.

In France the field may have been divided between Gallicanism and Ultramontanism when the sceptre passed from Napoleon I. to the Bourbons; but the former was commonly taught in the seminaries till near the middle of the century. Bailly's handbook of theology, which was more extensively used in France than any other, for sixty or seventy years after the Revolution of 1789, treated of the papal prerogatives in a distinctly Gallican vein.³ This indicates at least that Gallicanism held no inconsiderable place among the

¹ Letter addressed to the Duke of Norfolk on the Occasion of Mr. Gladstone's Recent Expostulation, p. 13.

² Restated in "The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance," pp. 157, 158.

³ Michaud, *De la Falsification des Catechismes Français et des Manuels de Théologie par le Parti Romaniste de 1670 à 1868*, pp. 117-131.

French clergy up to the fifth decade. With magistrates and statesmen, as is well known, it was the prevailing creed.

In Germany the collapse of the radical Gallicanism which had been sustained by Joseph II. naturally led to a somewhat cautious and reserved dealing with the subject of papal prerogatives. But if pronounced Gallicanism was wanting, there was also for an interval little of outspoken Ultramontanism. In the first decades of the nineteenth century the catechisms were mostly silent respecting the infallibility of the Pope. Those among theologians who favored it confessed generally that it belonged to the rank of mere opinions. With the advance of the century, while the current was divided, the weight of Roman Catholic learning in Germany may be said to have been against the high papal or Ultramontane theory. The tenor of Möhler's remarks is manifestly counter to any such dogmatic sufficiency and independence in the Pope as is implied by the Vatican formula.¹ The same may be said of Brenner and Rothensee. Drey, whose notable "Apologetik" was published in 1838, repudiated in plain terms the equivalent of the infallibility decree. "The Pope," he wrote, "is not by himself infallible. He is, indeed, the official successor of St. Peter, as the bishops are the successors of the apostles, but inspiration — the only sure guaranty of infallibility — the inspiration of St. Peter has been as little transmitted to him as the inspiration of the other apostles to the bishops."² Reaching on from

¹ *Symbolik und Kirchengeschichte*, quoted by Friedrich, *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils*, I. 527-529.

² *Ibid.*, I. 533.

Möhler and Drey the succession was ably kept up by Döllinger and others. Indeed, Roman Catholic learning in Germany began to be regarded at Rome as one of the most threatening clouds on the horizon. Ultramontane eyes saw in it the infection of the Protestant scientific method, and it was apprehended that its independent spirit would be fatal to papal absolutism. The alarm entertained is clearly reflected in the report of the papal nuncio at Munich in 1869. He represents a special type of liberalism as widely spread in the Church, and uses significantly the name of "Germanism" in its description. "This Germanism," he says, "is not, like the liberalism of some Catholics, simply an indulgent attitude toward modern ideas, or a reaction, armed with new principles, for liberating the Church from servitude to governments; but it is rather a declared sympathy with the scientific method and systems of the Protestants, and a reaction not at all against governments, but against the doctrinal influence of Rome and of the Sacred Congregations at Rome." In this circle, he complains, authority is relatively ignored, and belief must ask the consent of science and history.¹ As for the doctrine of infallibility, he says that it is sustained by very few professors in the public institutes. "By the most renowned and those accounted the ablest it is placed in doubt, is denied, and not seldom is ridiculed."² The remarks of Cecconi, the official historian of the Vatican Council, are quite in line with those of the

¹ Si ammettono i dommi, perchè la scienza e la storia li approva e conferma.

² Cecconi, *Storia del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano*, lib. iii. cap. vi. vol. ii. pp. 433-444.

nuncio. He declares that a most grave occasion for the distinct promulgation of papal infallibility was found in the excessive love of untrammelled science which was spreading through the Romish communion in Germany, by reason of continued contact with Protestantism. In fine, we are well assured that, in the thought of the papal party, there was great need of throttling the scientific impulse among the Roman Catholics of Germany. The Vatican Council was designed to accomplish this end, and its purpose has been followed up on the part of Leo XIII. by the formal commendation of the scholastic method as embodied in the works of Thomas Aquinas.¹

In Spain, Portugal, Italy and Spanish America — the field where the Inquisition had operated with least interruption — the spirit of independence found little place among the clergy. With moderate exceptions, they could be counted upon to march to the Ultramontane music. In this part of the Romish domain the basis for resistance to high papal claims in recent times has been located mostly in the lay element. The problem of papal absolutism, therefore, was a problem of addition. The task to be accomplished was such an extension of Ultramontane sentiment in France, Germany, and the northern districts, that these should cease to counterbalance the southern countries, and it should become safe to put every shade of Gallicanism under the ban.

The first conspicuous achievements of Ultramontane propagandism in the nineteenth century were made in

¹ Bull, *Æterni Patris Filius*, Aug. 4th, 1879; also his communication of the following year, in which he declares St. Thomas Aquinas the patron of Catholic universities, academies, faculties, and schools.

France. The fact that the Pope and the French clergy had alike suffered in the time of revolutionary upheaval created an extra measure of sympathy for the former. The memory of violence and disorder inclined many to place great emphasis upon central authority. As the settlement which was effected by Napoleon left the great mass of the lower clergy in a state of unwelcome dependence upon the bishops, they were interested to extend the intervention of the Pope as a shield against episcopal authority. Meanwhile, gifted champions of absolutist theories entered the field. Joseph de Maistre became the literary representative of the reaction against the Revolution, the eulogist of unrestricted monarchy in Church and State. Neither profundity of thought nor breadth of scholarship lay at the basis of his writings. His treatment of history was little better than a continuous distortion. But his confident tone and brilliant style were very effective with a large class. Lamennais, a prodigal writer of Ultramontane treatises, had similar gifts, and was perhaps still more influential. He shifted his ground, to be sure, in his later days, provoking the jealousy of his former admirers by striving to unite papal theocracy with the principles of political liberty, and finally attempting to escape from his entanglements through a repudiation of the Catholic faith. The lapse of the champion, however, did not stop the progress of his theories. Toward the middle of the century, the genius of Lacordaire and Montalembert was loaned to the Ultramontane cause. Still, it would appear that neither of these distinguished men was fully committed to the extreme papal theory. Lacordaire was led to criticise the extravagance of Ultramontane advocates,

and Montalembert spent his dying breath in solemnly protesting against the idolatrous project which was on the eve of its consummation at the Vatican Council. But there were other leaders who were hindered by no qualms or fears. Veuillot applied the editorial knife to all Gallican sentiment with remorseless industry. In order to make a god of the Pope, he was ready to treat bishops as small boys under the lash, and the pages of his organ, the *Univers*, continually illustrated how the arts of the brazen demagogue can be utilized for ecclesiastical and theological interests. Some of the other French journals afforded a similar style of religious tuition. With people having no liking for laborious scholarship, this editorial smartness was more effective than sober depth could have been. It told with the superficially educated clergy, and through them with the populace. To work upon the populace was counted by no means a matter of indifference. It was felt that a wave of popular sentiment could carry forward the papal cause quite as well as scientific conviction. Especially in the years immediately preceding the council this resource was abundantly employed. The Infallibility League, which originated with the Jesuits at Rome in 1866, and which bound its members even at the price of blood to profess the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility,¹ was set energetically to work in France, and its influence was supplemented by the use of petitions of an infallibilist type in connection with the widely extended prayer unions. All this naturally reacted upon the French episcopate, as it was meant to do. The bishops in large

¹ Cecconi, *Storia del Concilio Vaticano*, II. 434-436.

part were made halting and timid. Where they did not approve, they did not resist with adequate courage the absolutist scheme.

A similar agitation, though less ultra and sweeping, was promoted in Germany. The writings of Joseph de Maistre and Lamennais, which members of the Romantic School were interested to import, obtained a considerable circulation. Priests educated under Jesuit tuition in the Collegium Germanicum at Rome supplied a yearly reinforcement to the cause of Ultramontane propagandism. Journals were conducted in the same interest. Goerres, for example, who was converted to the theocratic system about 1820, used the Historico-political Journal of Munich as a vehicle of his passionate polemics. Finally, in 1848 and the years immediately following, a great popular instrumentality under the control of the Ultramontane school was instituted in "Der Katholische Verein." This was a network of associations, standing in close relations with the Pope, and acting as an offset to the influence of the bishops, where that influence was adverse to the Roman curia. It was an effective means of utilizing the laity for party ends. Besides intimidating the more liberal bishops, or serving as a counterpoise to their influence, it exercised a direct influence upon the filling of ecclesiastical offices. It should be noticed, however, that while the Catholic Association served actually as a means of Ultramontane propagandism, not all connected with it were distinctly committed to the infallibilist creed. The same may be said of the party of Goerres, which was in the field for the twenty years or more preceding the formation of the Association.

With the progress of the agitation in both France and Germany, sentences impregnated with an Ultramontane sense began to be insinuated into the catechisms. In some instances, also, extensive changes were made in theological works, while yet these works were published under the names of their authors. The extent in particular to which Bouvier's Theology and Bergier's Dictionary of Theology were perverted from their original teaching makes it proper to say that they were vandalized.¹

The friends of the papal monarchy, who labored for its interests in the nations which had been largely given to Gallican maxims, were of course zealously seconded from Rome. At an early point in the pontificate of Pius IX. a determination was manifested to brand every Gallican writing that might appear. Bailly's handbook of theology was put into the Index in 1853, though it had been in common use, as was noted above, for more than half a century. Two years earlier the Manual of Canon Law by Lequeux had met the like fate. Notwithstanding it represented only a mild type of Gallicanism, it was intolerable to the delicate sensibilities of the Index Congregation. In 1852 Guettée's History of the French Church, of which seven volumes had appeared, and to which the approbation of forty-two French prelates had been given, was in the same manner declared unfit for the faithful.² Episcopal addresses were condemned because they expressed a warm appreciation for the trend of French ecclesiastical history. In short, it was advertised from Rome as distinctly as it could be done by words or actions, that the papal enginery would do its

¹ Michaud, *De la Falsification.*

² *Ibid.*

best to grind to powder whatever might not bear the Ultramontane stamp. In Germany the faithful were similarly warned that the field of thought belongs to an Italian junto, and that all manœuvring therein must follow its prescriptions. Pius IX. renewed in 1847 the condemnation which had been passed upon the philosophical system of Hermes. Ten years later the writings of Günther, who attempted like Hermes to reconcile philosophical speculation with the faith, were put into the Index, and in 1862 the works of Frohschammer were likewise condemned. Well might German scholars of the Romish communion, in view of these and kindred developments, ask themselves whether it was worth while to think.

The policy of devouring dissenting opinions by casting them into the jaws of the Index was measurably effective. It had nevertheless its drawbacks. A degree of scepticism was provoked as to the propriety of such an instrument of orthodoxy. Some who counted themselves faithful children of the Church began to think that this method of striking in the dark — condemning without a hearing and without assigning any reasons — was a despotic nuisance. Writing to the Pope respecting a book of his which had been put into the Index in 1853, Huet declared: "A condemnation worked up in the dark, without citation, without questioning, without any possible defence, and which refuses to produce its reasons, is not a judgment, but a defamation."¹ More significant, if not more severe, was the language used by a company of laymen in a memorial presented to the Bishop of Treves in 1869. They maintained that the

¹ *Essais sur la Réforme Catholique*, p. 175.

Index, by its condemnations, often affixed a stigma upon men who had put the Church greatly in debt by their scholarly labors, and that it nurtured a fear prejudicial to scientific progress. For these and other reasons they ventured to express the wish that the council about to assemble would abolish the Index of Prohibited Writings.¹ Montalembert gave his approbation to this lay address,² and its recommendation respecting the Index was echoed by a number of voices.³

A zealous commendation of specifically Romish productions naturally accompanied the censure of all that which did not conform to this character. The displacement of the French liturgy (including the breviary) by the Roman, which was begun under Gregory XVI., was urged forward by Pius IX., though it was known that

¹ Cecconi. *Storia del Concilio Vaticano*, Doc. CLVII.

² Cecconi, Doc. CLIX.

³ Friedrich, II. 42, 43, 288, 315. It hardly needs to be noted that the authority which was alert to strike at Gallican literature, and at philosophical speculation which deviated from the scholastic track, could not tolerate Bibles distributed from Protestant presses. A number of papal blasts were sent forth against Bible Societies, Pius VII., Leo XII., Pius VIII., and Gregory XVI. successively warning the faithful against these agents of mischief. Gregory's encyclical, issued in 1844, is a trifle tortuous. He repudiates as slanderous the allegation that the Romish Church wishes to keep the Bible from the people; yet he enumerates a long list of instances in which the Church has prohibited or limited the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and ridicules as absurd the notion that they should be given unrestricted circulation. Describing the unholy work of the Bible Societies, he says: "They make common to the garrulous old woman, the doting old man, the wordy sophist, and to all men of every condition, provided only they can read, the art of understanding the Scriptures without an instructor; nay, which is absurdest of all, and almost unheard of, they do not even exclude unbelieving nations from such community of intelligence."

the Roman breviary was sadly in need of revision, being soiled by a considerable list of apocryphal items, and also offending against honesty by such a knavish procedure as the excision of the name of Honorius from the list of those condemned by the sixth ecumenical council. Too many of the fables were in the interest of papal autocracy to incline the Pope to keep back the breviary for necessary revision.¹ The claims of criticism stood equally in abeyance in relation to all works whose chief aim was to laud the papacy and to exalt its prerogatives. Pius IX. was very forward to crown books of this class with his formal approbation. Thus, on the eve of the council he honored with a commendatory brief Weniger's careless treatise on infallibility. During the session of the council he expressed his thanks for kindred tributes, among others for the labor of Jules Jacques in preparing an excerpt from Liguori on the subject of the Pope and the council, taking pains to praise the treatise as a valuable treasury of authentic tradition. In this commendation a fitting prelude was given to his act of the following year in proclaiming Liguori a *Doctor of the Church*,—a procedure which Döllinger characterizes as “the greatest monstrosity which has ever occurred in the domain of theological doctrine,” as lifting to the rank of an Augustine “a man whose false morals, perverse worship of the Virgin, and constant use of the grossest fables and forgeries, make his writings a storehouse of errors and lies.”²

¹ Gratty, First and Fourth Letters; Friedrich, I. 571-583.

² Letter to Pastor Widmann, Oct. 18, 1874. For instances of false citations in Liguori, see Döllinger and Reusch, Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten, I. 403-412.

One other factor in the papal propagandism may be noticed. Pius IX. was alert to improve every favorable occasion for a more or less direct assertion of his infallibility. In his first encyclical, published in November, 1846, his favorite dogma was already announced.¹ It was assumed, as has been indicated, in his declaration of the immaculate conception of the Virgin in 1854. It was more than assumed in the reference to this event which was put into the Roman breviary.² It was broadly hinted in the Pope's address to the assembled bishops on the occasion of the centenary of Peter in 1867;³ at least some of the initiated took the address in that sense.⁴ There are substantial reasons also for concluding that papal management lay back of the decisions of certain provincial and national councils which expressed themselves in favor of infallibility.⁵

¹ Atque hinc plane appetet, in quanto errore illi etiam versentur, qui ratione abutentes ac Dei eloquia tamquam humanum opus existimantes, proprio arbitrio illa explicare, interpretari temere audent, quum Deus ipse vivam constituerit auctoritatem, quæ verum legitimumque cœlestis suæ revelationis sensum doceret, constabiliret omnesque controversias in rebus fidei et morum infallibili judicio dirimeret, ne fideles circumferantur omni vento doctrinæ in nequitia hominum ad circumventionem erroris. . . . Et quoniam ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia ac Petrus per Romanum Pontificem loquitur, et semper in suis successoribus vivit et judicium exerceat, ac præstat quærentibus fidei veritatem, idcirco divina eloquia eo plane sensu sunt accipienda, quem tenuit ac tenet hæc Romana b. Petri Cathedra, quæ omnium Ecclesiarum mater et magistra, fidem a Christo Domino traditam integrum inviolatamque semper servavit eamque fideles edocuit, omnibus ostendens salutis semitam et incorruptæ veritatis doctrinam. (Friedrich, I. 414.)

² Pius IX. totius Ecclesiæ votis annuens statuit supremo suo atque infallibili oraculo solemniter proclamare.

³ Cecconi, Doc. X.

⁴ Manning, True Story of the Vatican Council, pp. 49, 50.

⁵ Friedrich, I. 584-611.

After this narrative of the general preparation for the Vatican Council, it follows in the proper order that some notice should now be taken of the special preparation. The latter, it may safely be affirmed, was of a type which had never been exemplified before in connection with any ecumenical assembly.

The idea of the council was broached in 1864. Already in 1865 work was begun upon the mould which was to determine the shape of the coming assembly. At the meeting of the commission of cardinals having the subject in charge, which was held in March of that year, the secretary, the Archbishop of Sardis, was circumspect enough to note the importance of having a large crowd of Italian bishops at the council. The obvious reason of the suggestion, as appears in the statement of the official historian, was the fact that the Italian bishops, who far surpassed in number those of any other nation, could be counted upon to sustain the policy of the Roman See.¹ This point, however, was nothing exceptional or novel. It had been a papal maxim since the time of the great reform councils at the beginning of the fifteenth century, that the safety of a council depends upon a preponderance of the Italian element.

Among the new features was the appointment of commissions to work up in entire secrecy the whole list of

¹ Cecconi, I. 23, 24. L'arcivescovo di Sardia averte in due luoghi l'importanza dell'intervento al Concilio dei vescovi italiani. Ognun sa, in fatti, che se non rispetto al numero totale dei pastori delle Chiese, certo in confronto di quello dei vescovi di qualunque altra nazione è ben copioso il numero dei vescovi d'Italia. I quali, a cagione della vicinanza alla Cattedra di Pietro, si sono sempre mantenuti così fedeli alle tradizioni di lei, che la loro presenza ai concili è a buon dritto giudicata qual validissimo sostegno della Sedia apostolica.

matters to be brought before the council. In filling these commissions character and scholarship were by no means the sole considerations ; the party stripe counted for as much as anything ; and very little besides the Ultramontane element obtained any place either in the dogmatic or the less important commissions. A little less than a third of the whole number of consulters in these bodies came from the outside nations. The schemata prepared by these commissions were not of course given a definitive authority ; for in that case the calling of a professedly deliberative assembly would have been a transparent mockery. Still the great lines of action were in this way predetermined, and it was of the nature of a shackle upon the council to be confronted with a mass of propositions which had been formulated by bodies with whose selection and work it had been conceded no function whatever.

Another innovation, thoroughly contradictory to the general custom of the Church, was the imposition of rules of procedure upon the council by a papal constitution. Among the matters included in these rules was the right of introducing propositions, the mode of discussing and voting, the officiary of the assembly, and the preservation of secrecy respecting its deliberations. The council was saved the trouble of considering any of these points. It received its standing officers from the hand of the Pope. As respects the initiative, or the right of introducing matters to the council, it was decided in the preparatory congregation that it belongs in the full sense to the Roman pontiff alone. The bishops, it was determined, have only an indirect and qualified right as regards this function. To provide for the exercise of

this duly guarded and circumscribed prerogative, it was arranged that a special commission, selected by the Pope, should decide upon the admissibility of propositions. Thus the right of initiative on the part of the council was reduced to the right of petitioning a papal creature to unbar the door. The creature might act with some liberality ; but since it was a creature with whose making the council had nothing to do, this body was left with no other right of initiative than that of begging a chance for a hearing.

In the matter of amending propositions more of liberty was allowed. Four commissions, elected by vote of the council, and sitting respectively upon questions of dogma, discipline, religious orders, and Oriental affairs, took the amendments proposed into consideration. Those offering the amendments, however, had no acknowledged right to appear before the commissions in order to justify their suggestions. There was also this chilling fact for the minority, that they had scarcely any representation in the commissions, the elections having taken place on a partisan basis. The dogmatic commission, as described by an organ of the majority, contained not a single person who was not distinguished by Ultramontane sympathies.

Thus everything was completely at the disposition of the Pope and those who were known to side with his absolutist scheme. To be sure, considerable freedom was allowed to the bishops in the way of speech-making, the prerogative of closing the debates, which the rules of procedure put into the hands of the majority, being exercised with a fair degree of moderation. But something more than heterogeneous debate is needed to make an

assembly truly deliberative and free. To be allowed to speak freely under conditions which necessarily destroy or greatly injure the effect of speaking, is not a privilege which has the true value of freedom. That this was the case at the Vatican Council is shown by two facts additional to those just cited. In the first place, the hall, to which the Pope kept the Council from first to last (Dec. 8, 1869, to July 18, 1870¹), was so poorly adapted to speaking that only men of superior elocution could be heard with any degree of satisfaction. A month and a half after the opening of the council Cardinal Pietro confessed that up to that time he had not been able to follow a single speech. That his inability grew out of no special deafness is evinced by abundant testimony. Archbishop Darboy, for example, compared the assembly to a jury called upon to render their verdict in a capital case without having heard the evidence; and Bishop Hefele, after the employment of a special expedient for improving the acoustic properties of the hall, declared that often he could not hear speakers in close proximity. But this limitation deserves less notice than that involved in the moral pressure which the Pope repeatedly exercised. In responses to various addresses which favored his absolute authority, he not only gave free expression to his gratification over such loyal sentiments, but threw out hints that those of dissenting views were virtually enemies of the Church, "imbued with corrupt principles, . . . men who do not cease to trouble Catholic hearts by artifice and sophistry." Oriental ecclesiastics who did not render the full measure of subserviency

¹ The council was not formally suspended till October 20th, but it had no real significance after July 18th.

were put under discipline, a speech of the Chaldean patriarch, which was judged to be recalcitrant, being answered by a burst of papal wrath, and the demand of submission under pain of instant deposition. At a distribution of ornaments to vicars apostolic and to the Oriental bishops the Pope used language which implied that it was necessary to stand by him in the matter of infallibility, and the spokesman of the party addressed understood the words in that sense. In a speech delivered in the American College his Holiness openly expressed his regret that a part of the American bishops were numbered with the opposition. Cardinal Guidi, a Dominican, for making an anti-infallibilist speech which produced a marked impression in the council, was loaded with reproaches, and required to take his choice between retraction and suspension. Other items of a like tenor might be added, such as the slight cast by the Pope upon the memory of Montalembert, whom he stigmatized as a half Catholic when the news of his death had been received ; also the discharge of Theiner from his office of Prefect of the Vatican Archives, because he was thought to have admitted bishops of the minority to historical information which it was considered best to keep secret.¹ In truth, so notorious was the fact of papal pressure, that Hergenröther has deemed it politic to admit and to justify it, rather than to enter a denial. He writes : "It is said that in the disputes respecting the council the Pope most plainly sided with one party, encouraging and commanding the infallibilists by word and in writing, and blaming their opponents. Should he

¹ For these various items see the oft cited work of Friedrich ; also Darboy's treatise, *La Liberté du Concile et l'Infallibilité*.

then be silent when men were beginning to cast doubts upon a truth of which he was convinced, were intimidating and holding up to scorn the most faithful defenders of the Holy See, were announcing as true theological doctrine propositions long ago censured and condemned, and going even so far as to call the doctrine of infallibility an heretical doctrine? Is it not the duty and right of the Pope to protect the faith of the Roman Church from calumny, to defend it at every point, and to uphold the decrees and censures of his predecessors?"¹ The reference to intimidation needs little comment in face of the long period of papal bulldozing which had preceded the council, and had served to reduce the episcopate wellnigh to silence as regards any free expression of liberal or Gallican sentiment. For the rest, the apology of the learned professor assumes that the council was not assembled for any real discussion and determination of dogma on the basis of fact and reason, but merely to serve the Pope in giving a more solemn announcement to the creed already settled beyond revision in his mind. On this basis, however, it was decidedly farcical to clothe the council to any extent with the garb of a deliberative assembly. It would have been better to have relegated the bishops to the position of hand-clappers, having their place in the auditorium rather than on the stage. That this modern theory of the papal office must reduce the ecumenical council to a spectacle, a paltry fiasco, cannot recommend it to those who possess any degree of historic sense.

The persistent activity of the Pope in behalf of the

¹ Catholic Church and Christian State, Essays on the Relation of the Church to the Civil Power, I. 145.

high papal scheme shows what the council was called for, and cancels the special pleading of those who have asserted that the proclamation of infallibility had little or no place in its design. Let it be granted that the dogma was not openly put to the front by those who manipulated the preparation for the council; this was simply the dictate of prudence. It was perfectly certain that Ultramontane champions would be ready to bring the subject before the council whenever the Pope should wish, and it was judged that its introduction by request of the bishops would have a better effect than to bring it up as a part of the regular schema on the Church, prepared beforehand. That the dogmatic commission decided on this policy a few days after the *Civiltà Cattolica* had published the suggestion that papal infallibility would be declared by acclamation,¹ is a very probable evidence of what was in the minds of those at headquarters. The protestation of Cardinal Manning and others is quite wasted. The conviction of the Christian world,—which sprang up immediately after the famous intimation of the Jesuitico-papal organ,—that the impending council meant papal absolutism and infallibility has been signally justified by the whole course of events that followed.

In the nature of Pius IX. there was a considerable zone of enthusiasm and fantasy. The way in which he patronized the affair at Lourdes is significant of a trait that found other manifestations. The report, therefore, which sympathetic friends of his put into circulation,

¹ The article of the *Civiltà Cattolica* appeared on February 6, 1869. The Commission began its consideration of infallibility on February 11. (Cecconi, I. 274, 275.)

that he regarded the proclamation of infallibility as the consummating act of a great providential mission, and looked toward it with the ardor of a devotee, is entirely credible. This spirit in the Pope, seconded by the trustworthy adherents whom all the force of papal patronage had been able to gather during more than a score of years,¹ made the cause of the opposition wellnigh hopeless from the start. Only by the most resolute policy, making it evident that they would never submit to the absolutist scheme, could they have secured any real prospect of thwarting its consummation. A determination so firm and outspoken as to involve a threat of schism might well have called the Pope and his advisers to a halt; for the opponents of the definition of infallibility formed a party at once important in respect of numbers and formidable in consideration of the communities which they represented. At an early date in the proceedings an infallibilist wrote: "Of seven hundred members of the council about five hundred might be counted for and two hundred against the seasonableness of defining the doctrine of infallibility. This is a minority, but an imposing minority when two facts are considered. First, that these two hundred bishops are for the greater part French, German, and American, belonging therefore to the three nations which march at the head of civilization, bishops too who have been most closely related to the movement of modern ideas, and the advance of a prudent freedom, and at the same time have given most evidences of practical devotion to the cause of the Church and of

¹ In 1869 all the cardinals but twelve and all but sixty-nine of the bishops having dioceses (excluding the twelve cardinals) had been created under the auspices of Pius IX. (Friedrich, I. 438.)

the Holy See. The other point is, that in the majority there figure more than two hundred bishops *in partibus*, and missionary bishops, who, since their dioceses exist not yet or no longer, cannot witness to a constant tradition of the same.”¹

This estimate may have been a trifle generous as respects the strength of the minority; still, at the time it was written it could not greatly have exceeded the facts. At the preliminary vote on the infallibility decree, which took place July 13th, while four hundred and fifty-one gave an unqualified affirmative (*Placet*), eighty-eight gave an unqualified negative (*Non placet*), and sixty-two expressed by the form of their vote (*Placet juxta modum*) a desire for amendment.² Though their cause was understood to be lost, fifty-six signed a declaration before leaving Rome that they adhered to their *Non placet*, and two voted in this form at the public session, when the decree of infallibility was formally promulgated (July 18, 1870). Of the five hundred and thirty-three who voted *Placet* on this occasion, the great majority were from Italy and the Spanish countries. Four fifths of them, it has been computed, belonged to the list of Italian bishops, cardinals, officers of the curia, and apostolic vicars. It is manifest, accordingly, that the minority, in consideration of the wide territory which they represented, had it in their power, by a show of inflexible determination, to make it plain that the scheme of papal deification could be consummated only at a tremendous hazard. But they did not exhibit this measure of determination. At critical points they gave tokens of a faltering courage

¹ Friedrich, III. 206, 207.

² It is fair to note that some of these were decided infallibilists.

and resolution. While their recorded statements show that a large proportion of them were inwardly sceptical respecting the fact of infallibility in the Vatican sense, and not merely respecting the opportuneness of definition, they were prepared neither for the sacrifice of position nor for the ignominy of schism. Their opponents consequently, as also clear-sighted critics among their friends, prophesied that in the end they would submit. A probability of final submission neutralized the force of their protests in the face of a party which was laboring to enthrone arbitrary sovereignty above reason and history.¹

Much that is contained in the preceding volumes, as well as in the present, is of the nature of a comment on the merits of the Vatican decrees. It will be appropriate, therefore, to add only a few considerations in the present connection.

¹ We have not thought it worth while to notice mere incidents, such as the violent storm at the time when the Papal dogmas were being sealed,—a thunderous accompaniment in which some have been pleased to hear nature's *Non placet*. It is of much more account to notice the storms of passionate agitation which occasionally stirred the grave fathers. Manning confesses that the usual calm of the assembly was interrupted by two occasions of uproar (True Story, p. 163). Archbishop Kenrick's testimony indicates that an unseemly heat was not unfrequently manifested. Referring to the sane maxim, that opinions not certainly contained in the deposit of faith cannot be enforced under stress of anathema, he wrote: In Concilio Vaticano ista distinctio non videtur servata. Inde factum est, ut, quod nunquam antea in conciliis evenit, episcopi in varias sententias abeant: non certe de fidei doctrinis, quarum sunt testes et custodes, sed de sententiis scholarum, disputantes. Aula conciliaris in arenam theologicam conversa est; patronis utriusque sententiae, non tantum in re pontificie infallibilitatis, sed in aliis, hinc inde digladiantibus, eo animorum aestu qui theologis potius quam episcopis mos est, neutrisque autem convenit. (Concio, p. 42.)

In the first place those decrees involve an element of dogmatic tyranny. It was essentially an odious procedure to impose, under pain of anathema, beliefs which had not been required for eighteen centuries, and which moreover had been denied either explicitly or implicitly by bishops, saints, doctors, popes, and ecumenical councils. The imposition may not have been grievous to those who, theologically speaking, could scarcely distinguish their right hand from their left. It may not be grievous now to those who have renounced the core of manhood by adopting the Jesuit maxim of the *sacrificio dell' intelletto*. But there were minds in 1870 to which it was like the edge of a knife to the living flesh. To require men with the historical insight of Hefele and Maret to subscribe to papal infallibility, as proclaimed at the Vatican council, can only be likened to an aggravated case of manslaughter.¹

¹ Some idea of the ordeal imposed upon Hefele may be obtained from several declarations of his in the months which followed the council : September 14, 1870, he wrote : "I have already thought upon abdicating [the episcopal office], but have again given up the idea, and will drink the cup which is presented to me. I know not at least what else to do. To recognize something which in itself is untrue for divinely revealed, let him do it who can, I cannot." November 11, 1870, he penned these lines : "Here in Rottenburg I can as little conceal from myself as I could in Rome, that the new dogma lacks a true Biblical and traditional foundation, and injures the Church immeasurably, so that she has never suffered a more bitter or deadly stroke." In the same connection, he commented on the course of the German episcopate as a body, "which has changed its conviction over night, and in part gone over to a very zealous and persecuting infallibilism." January 25, 1871, he wrote : "Unhappily I must say, with Schulte, 'I lived for many years grossly deceived.' I believed I was serving the Catholic Church, and I served the caricature which Romanism and Jesuitism have made out of it. First in Rome it became thoroughly clear to me that what one aims after and practises there

In the second place, it speaks ill for the Vatican decrees that the possibility of their promulgation grew out of the most shameless forgeries. Let it be granted that the bishops of the Ultramontane party did not profess to defend the Pseudo-Isidore decretals, that mass of fictions which was imported into the Church in the ninth century. Let it be granted that they did not generally support the apocryphal clauses which were inserted in Cyprian's treatise on the Unity of the Church near the close of the sixth century. Let it be granted that they were not committed to all the additional falsifications which appear in Gratian and other canonists. Grant finally, that, as a body, they were not disposed formally to sustain the fictitious quotations from Greek fathers and early councils, which were concocted in the thirteenth century, and were incorporated by the deceived Aquinas into writings whose influence was dominant in the succeeding centuries. Admit all this, and one must still hold that a majority of the bishops in the Ultramontane school were intellectually victims of these forgeries. Manifold inferences from the spurious and falsified documents had been filtered into the subsequent literature. Not only this: portions of these venerable lies had kept their place in books which were the daily food of the bishops, especially in the Latin nations. Out of twenty passages quoted by Melchior Cano from the earlier popes, on the privileges of the Holy See, eighteen were taken from the false decretals, and two

has only the appearance and the name of Christianity, only the husk; the kernel has disappeared, and all is totally externalized." (Schulte, *Der Altkatholicismus*, pp. 223-228.) What a preface to the submission which the learned bishop made a few months later!

spurious letters attributed to Athanasius were also cited. Then came Bellarmin, who drew from the same sources; and then the uncritical Liguori, who was content to build on these predecessors, and actually appropriated to his use the whole list of false passages adduced by Cano.¹ As Liguori, a canonized saint, was a writer held in extraordinary repute where the high papal theories prevailed, it is easy to see that the daily fare of the bishops in a large section of the Church was plentifully seasoned with falsehoods. Nor was the celebrated Redemptorist the only channel of connection with mediaeval forgery. A writer who knew his ground as few men of his generation could claim to know it has recorded this challenge: "I offer to bring forward proofs that the bishops of the Romane countries, Spain, Italy, South America, and France, who formed the enormous majority at Rome, had, together with their clergy, as regards the papal power, already been led astray by books of doctrine out of which they had derived their knowledge during their college years; for the passages quoted in these books as proofs are for the most part false, fabricated, and garbled. This I will prove, first, from the two principal works and favorite text-books of the present theological schools and colleges, the Moral Theology of Saint Alphonse Liguori, especially in the tract it contains on the Pope, and from the Theology of the Jesuit Perrone; secondly, from the writings of Archbishop Cardoni and Bishop Ghilardi, which were distributed in Rome at the time of the council, and finally from the Theology of the theologian Schwetz of Vienna."²

¹ Gratty, Second Letter.

² Döllinger, Letter to Archbishop von Scherr, March 28, 1871.

To undeceive men who had been nurtured in such an intellectual atmosphere was no easy task. Though able writings were issued shortly before the council, and during its session, in exposure of the falsities on which the absolutist theory was built,—writings like those of Döllinger,¹ Maret,² and Gratry,³—most of the bishops had neither the requisite opportunity nor the disposition to test their trenchant criticisms. The pertinacious industry of Archbishop Connolly of Halifax, who satisfied himself, after coming to Rome, respecting the unsubstantial nature of the supports adduced for papal infallibility, was rarely imitated.

Once more, it tends to the discredit of the Vatican decrees that only a few sentences can be quoted for them from the early history of the Church, and that even these must be warped and taken out of their connection in order to exhibit any favorable significance. Irenæus, for example, is cited as saying that it is necessary to agree with the Roman Church. But the context shows that he had in mind the apostolic churches as being depositaries of valid tradition, and that he named the Roman Church simply as a distinguished example of a class. His thought was the moral obligation to seek the truth where by reason of distinct apostolic connections it was likely at that early day to be found. That he did not mean to concede a constitutional supremacy, much less an infallible headship, to the Roman See, was

¹ He is understood to have had a principal hand in the composition of “Janus” (1869), a book often maligned, but never refuted in its main contentions.

² *Du Concile Général et de la Paix Religieuse.*

³ Letters to Mgr. Dechamps.

made manifest by his opposition to the policy of Victor in the Easter question, an opposition carried to the point of expressly advising the churches not to follow the course dictated by the headstrong Bishop of Rome.¹ Again, Augustine is quoted as saying, in connection with the Pelagian controversy, "Rome has spoken, the cause is ended." Now, in the first place, this is not what Augustine said. He spoke of the cause as being finished because two councils and the Roman bishop had rendered a concordant decision;² moreover, had not the decision been so perfectly agreeable to his mind, he would have expressed himself quite differently, as was shown by the way in which he, with the North African clergy, corrected Zosimus. In the second place, Augustine plainly indicates his conviction that upon a point which has not been decided by a general council one is not obliged to agree with the Roman bishop. This is evinced in the excuse which he offers for Cyprian's position on the subject of rebaptism.³ In various other connections, also, he indicates that the definitive decision of any important question rests with a general council.⁴ With as little fairness as Augustine is quoted, the Council of Chalcedon is represented as exclaiming, "Peter has spoken through Leo," as though

¹ See Early Church, chap. iv. sect. i.

² Jam enim, de hac causa, duo concilia missa sunt ad Sedem Apostolicam, inde etiam rescripta venerunt. Causa finita est: utinam aliquando finiatur error. (Serm. cxxxii.)

³ Nec nos ipsi tale aliquid auderemus asserere nisi universæ Ecclesiæ concordissimæ auctoritate firmati. Cui et ipse [Cyprianus], sine dubio cederet, si jam illo tempore questionis hujus veritas eliquata et declarata per plenarium concilium solidaretur. (De Bapt. cont. Donat., lib. ii. n. 5.)

⁴ Epist. xlivi. n. 19; De Bapt. cont. Donat., lib. vii. n. 102.

the assembled fathers only needed to hear the voice of the Roman bishop to be assured of the true teaching. But the facts are, that the letter of Leo was closely examined, and was approved by the fathers of Chalcedon only because it was agreeable to their theological convictions ; that Cyril of Alexandria received equal honor with Leo in the same connection ;¹ and that a considerable party in the council made Cyril rather than Leo the standard, so that they needed to be assured of the agreement of the latter with the former before approving his epistle. Other isolated passages fade equally into thin mist when subjected to a critical examination. The most that is left is a meagre list of sentences, beginning on the border of the middle ages, and uttered principally by the Roman bishops themselves in the spirit of vanity and sinful boasting. And even these sentences are far more justly understood as claiming simply indefectibility in the sense of Bossuet, than infallibility in the sense of the Vatican Council. A flimsy basis surely for the vast edifice of infallibility ! Especially must this appear to be the case when it is observed that these *isolated sentences* are offset by facts of *continental breadth* : such as the settlement of great doctrinal controversies with little or no reference to the Roman bishop ; the absence of all consciousness that his fiat could end dogmatic disputes ; and the condemnation by ecumenical councils of a Roman bishop as a teacher and

¹ Mansi, vi. 971. Hæc patrum fides, hæc apostolorum fides, omnes ita credimus, orthodoxi ita credunt. Anathema ei qui ita non credit. Petrus per Leonem ita locutus est. Apostoli ita docuerunt. Pie et vere Leo docuit. Cyrilus ita docuit. Cyrilli æterna memoria. Leo et Cyrilus similiter docuerunt, anathema ei qui sic non credit.

patron of heresy. How great is the strait of Ultramontane apologetics in connection with this last order of facts may be judged from the declaration of Hergenröther, that Honorius neither taught heresy nor was condemned for heresy,—a desperate assertion, which Gratry made to appear ridiculous in the time of the council, and which needs no further refutation than bare quotation from the documents.

In a double sense, the promulgation of papal infallibility was a victory of the Jesuits. While it crowned their efforts, put forth with special vigor after the founding of the Civiltà Cattolica in 1850, it also illustrated on a broad scale their casuistry. The manner in which the most weighty historical objections were set aside, and a meagre and broken chain of insufficient testimonies was regarded as supplying the necessary traditional basis, was a most barefaced application of the principle of probabilism; at least, on the part of the better informed bishops.

The bishops accepted their position as the servants of an absolute master. But there was a group of scholarly men, as has been noted in the preceding chapter, who would not bend their necks to the Vatican yoke, and who formed a separate communion under the name of Old Catholics. In 1873 they completed their organization in Germany by the election of a bishop (Reinkens), who received consecration through the medium of the Jansenist Church in Holland. In 1878 the marriage of priests was made permissible, though the measure encountered considerable opposition. Departure has also been made from Romish custom by the use of the

vernacular in the liturgy and the reduction of auricular confession to the rank of an optional practice. At the end of twelve or fifteen years from their organization the Old Catholics numbered about forty thousand in the German Empire, seven thousand in Austria, and seventy thousand in Switzerland, with scattered adherents in France and Italy. It can hardly be said, therefore, that they have been successful, if we look simply to the dimensions of their schism. But there is another side to the movement. Viewed as a protest, it has accomplished no mean results; for the writings of the Old Catholics are a most powerful historical witness against the dogmas of papal absolutism and infallibility.¹

Within this party Döllinger has doubtless attracted most attention, on account of his strong personality and exceptional reputation for learning. The anxiety of infallibilists to bring him over to their side may be judged from the fact that already in 1878 it was announced for the fourteenth time in Ultramontane papers that he had made his submission.² Persons in high position did not shun to implore him to seek reconciliation with the Church. Requests of this kind were sometimes proffered in very respectful terms. Bishop Hefele, for example, spoke of his "undying respect for the great scholar." But what reasons could they give for the step which they advised? What reasons could Hefele offer, a man who declared at the time of the

¹ Among the distinguished scholars connected with the movement were Döllinger, Reinkens, Friedrich, Huber, Michelis, Reusch, Langen, and Von Schulte. In France Michaud gave his voice for the Old Catholics, and the distinguished ex-Carmelite preacher Père Hyacinthe (Charles Loyson) also labored with them for a time.

² Letter to an Old Catholic, June 23, 1878.

council that for thirty years he had sought papal infallibility in the early Church and could never find it? With all respect for those who poured their solicitations upon the veteran scholar, one might without much injustice compare them to a group of silly old women asking a Galileo to make his peace with God and the Church by renouncing his affirmation of the earth's revolution. Döllinger ever looked upon the submission asked for as a caprice which sanity and honesty alike must repudiate, and responded to every occasion for the declaration of his convictions with an intensity that often imparted a strain of genuine eloquence to his words. A few passages may well be cited in illustration of his thought and manner. Writing to Archbishop von Scherr on the eve of his excommunication, in 1871, he says: "I beg your grace to consider that according to the nature of the thing, according to the express declaration of the Pope, and according to the admission of all infallibilists, the doctrine we are now called upon to confess forms one, or rather the fundamental, article of faith, and that it directly affects the question of the *regula fidei*, the rule of faith which has to decide what is or what is not to be believed. In future every Catholic Christian, when asked why he believes this or that, can and may give but the one answer: I believe or reject it because the infallible Pope has bidden it to be believed or rejected. . . . How has it then been possible that for eighteen centuries the Popes have winked at the denial of this fundamental article of faith by whole countries and in whole theological schools? And was there a unity of the Church where there was a difference in the very fundaments of belief? And may I further add, how is

it then that your Grace yourself resisted so long and so persistently the proclamation of this dogma? You answer, ‘Because it was not opportune.’ But can it ever be ‘inopportune’ to give believers the key to the whole building of faith, to proclaim the fundamental article on which all others depend? . . . As Christian, as theologian, as historian, as citizen, I cannot accept this doctrine. I cannot do so as a Christian, because it is incompatible with the spirit of the Gospel, and with the lucid sayings of Christ and the apostles; it simply wishes to establish the kingdom of this world, which Christ declined to do, and to possess the sovereignty over the congregations, which Peter refused for every one else, as well as for himself. I cannot do so as a theologian, because the whole genuine tradition of the Church stands irreconcilably opposed to it. I cannot do so as an historian, because as such I know that the persistent endeavor to realize this theory of a universal sovereignty has cost Europe streams of blood, distracted and ruined whole countries, shaken to its foundations the beautiful organic edifice of the constitution of the older Church, and begotten, nursed, and maintained the worst abuses in the Church. Finally, I must reject it as a citizen, because with its claims on the submission of states and monarchs and the whole political order of things to the papal power, and through the exceptional position claimed by it for the clergy, it lays the foundation for an endless and fatal discord between the State and the Church, between the clergy and the laity.” In 1879 he wrote: “Having devoted during the last nine years my time principally to the renewed study of all the questions connected with the history of the popes

and the councils, and, I may say, gone over the whole ground of ecclesiastical history, the result is, that the proofs of the falsehood of the Vatican decrees amount to a demonstration. When I am told that I must swear to the truth of those doctrines my feeling is just as if I were asked to swear that two and two make five, and not four.” Responding near the same time to a lady of rank who besought him to make his submission, he said : “I ought, as the favorite expression of the Jesuits runs, ‘to make a sacrifice of my intellect’ (*sacrificio dell’ intelletto*). This is what your ladyship also demands of me. But if I did so, in a question which is for the historical eye perfectly clear and unambiguous, there would then no longer be for me any such thing as historical truth and certainty ; I should then have to suppose that my whole life long I had been in a world of dizzy illusion, and that in historical matters I am altogether incapable of distinguishing truth from fable and falsehood. The very ground would thus be taken away from under my feet, and that, too, for my religious views ; since even our religion is founded, of course, on historical facts.”

III.—**ECCLESIASTICO-POLITICAL MATTERS.**

The animus of the papacy which is reflected in the Syllabus of 1864 had been exemplified with sufficient pertinacity during the preceding half-century. In controversies between absolutism and popular rights the papal sympathy was generally given to the former. Thus Leo XII. in 1824 admonished Louis XVIII. to eliminate from the French constitution articles which savored of liberalism ; and Gregory XVI. was so much disturbed by the free spirit of the Belgic constitution

that he issued in 1832 an encyclical, wherein he condemned as pestiferous errors freedom of conscience and liberty of the press. Pius IX. repeatedly indicated that he was of the same mind. To be sure, at the beginning of his pontificate he excited expectations of a liberal course, and it is recorded that in 1848 he granted a constitution to the Roman people. But it was the demand of a great crisis which led to this step. The concession, too, which he was persuaded to make was not of the most generous order. The constitution did not provide for any true sovereignty in the people, since the chambers could take no definitive action, the measures which they might desire to enact being passed over to the secret conclave of the Pope and the cardinals. Pius IX., moreover, was soon weaned from all desire to experiment with constitutions. After his temporary flight from Rome (1848-50), he might be described, like Gregory XVI., as "the incarnated reaction."

This favor to political absolutism was doubtless in a sense congenial to the nature of the papal system. An absolute monarch, provided only he can be persuaded to act as the servant of the Pope, or at least as his friendly ally, is the most convenient adjunct to theocratic sovereignty that can be conceived, as being the readiest and swiftest instrument for carrying out its behests. Still the recognition of this fact probably had less to do with the policy of the popes, than dread of the disintegrating energy which the French Revolution had taught them to associate with democratic principles.¹

¹ It may be noted that in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, an organ specially commended by Pius IX., and a mirror in general of his opinions, constitutional monarchy has been characterized as an absurd system. (Series vii. vol. vi. p. 311.)

That the papal bias against constitutional rule was not due to any extravagant respect for sovereigns was indicated in various connections. They were in fact very ready to abridge, in the interest of their own superintendence, the power which they did not like to have shared with the people. This was illustrated by their claim to regulate the subject of marriage for all Roman Catholics, whether under Protestant or Romish governments. They were unwilling to recognize the parity between communions which was involved in the Peace of Westphalia, and insisted that in connection with mixed marriages the guaranties should all be in favor of the Romish religion. In 1830, Pius VIII., repeating a requisition made at an earlier date, but not always enforced, enjoined that dispensations for marriages between Roman Catholics and Protestants should not be granted except on condition of a promise that the children should be educated in the faith of the Romish Church. As the bishops were brought under pressure to carry out this instruction, a controversy with the Prussian government ensued, and was carried on with considerable heat during the years which immediately preceded the accession of Frederic William IV. (1840). The new prince quieted the agitation, though no agreement as respects principles was effected. A generation later, as was noticed previously, civil marriage was decreed in Prussia and also in the new German empire,—a method of declaring the prerogatives of the State in this matter which has been adopted very largely by Roman Catholic governments.¹

¹ Civil marriage was enjoined in the Prussian constitution of 1848, but the provision seems not to have been carried into actual effect. In an his-

In connection with education there was a like endeavor, on the part of the Popes, to maintain ecclesiastical control. Nor was their endeavor wholly fruitless. Especially in connection with the reaction which followed the revolutionary agitations of 1848, they were able to score victories. Among these the most notable was secured in Austria. By the concordat of 1855, the entire school system was handed over to clerical management, as was also the censure of books. Indeed, so little was reserved to the State in this remarkable treaty, that Ultramontane enthusiasts were inclined to hail it as the harbinger of a golden age of theocratic rule.¹ The privileges which the ecclesiastical side obtained in the Württemberg concordat (or convention) in 1857, and also in the concordat with Baden in 1859, if much less extensive, were enough to afford the Roman curia a measure of gratification. It was a short-lived satisfaction, however, which they contributed. That of Baden aroused so great an agitation, that it was cancelled in 1860, and laws were passed in the interest

torical sketch of legislation on the subject up to the year 1870, Friedberg says: "In the preceding century civil marriage existed only in Holland and France, — transiently also in England. In the first seventy years of the present century it has obtained a place in Italy, England, Austria, most German states, Belgium, Switzerland, the Scandinavian states, Denmark, the principalities on the Danube, Spain, and a part of the Spanish states of America." In France, a law for granting divorce, with the privilege of remarriage, was passed in 1884.

¹ The Bishop of Bruges wrote, in 1857: "If I am not greatly deceived, the concordat recently concluded between Pius IX. and the Emperor of Austria has given a blow to pagan politics and to antichristian jurisprudence from which they will not recover. This admirable treaty has given a new adjustment to the two powers." (Quoted by Stap, *L'Immaculée Conception*, p. 303.)

of civil supremacy which anticipated in some points the legislation of Prussia and the German Empire in the Kulturkampf. Public schools were placed under the control of the State, other institutions of learning were made subject to its inspection, and civil marriage was sanctioned. The example of Roman Catholics in Baden naturally reinforced the dissatisfaction which the Protestant majority in Württemberg felt toward the convention of 1857. It was accordingly abrogated in 1861, and laws similar to those of Baden were passed. Civil marriage had already been legitimated in Württemberg in 1855, as a resource in cases of collision. The Pope was of course afflicted by these developments. In a brief addressed to the Archbishop of Freiburg in 1864, some months before the issuing of the Syllabus, he condemned the expulsion of church authority from the schools, and intimated that this policy would necessitate the advice to the faithful that such schools could not be attended with a good conscience.

The Roman Catholic Church in Prussia received considerable concessions from the government in 1850, and it enjoyed in the following years a large amount of independence. Indeed, after the adoption of a constitution and the limitation of clerical rule in the Austrian territories (1867–68), Roman Catholics had as free scope in Prussia as in any Germanic country. The Papal nuncio at Munich testified in 1869 to the relative satisfaction of Catholics under Prussian rule with their privileges as accorded by the State.¹ It would appear, therefore, that it was no special hardship or threatened deprivation which called forth the clerical party in 1870, but rather

¹ Ceconi, *Storia del Concilio Vaticano*, vol. ii. p. 447.

the sectarian feeling that it was necessary; through a consolidation of Roman Catholics into a distinct political force, to prepare an offset to the vast aggrandizement which the fortunes of war had given to a Protestant state.¹

In the French realm the control of education was exercised from the early part of the century through the University of France. Its supervision extended over all schools, except episcopal seminaries for the training of priests. Efforts were made, however, toward the middle of the century, to abridge its prerogatives. The Jesuits, who had maintained a number of establishments, though their order was without legal existence in the country, engaged in the agitation, with the design of securing enlarged scope for their own activity. Their attempt miscarried for the time being, and resulted in the closing of their houses. Still, a change was soon effected in the educational system, which enlarged the sphere of clerical supervision. By the law of 1850, elementary schools were placed under the direction of the clergy. The rule of Napoleon III., who betrayed the Second Republic and introduced the Second Empire in 1852, was in general favorable to the influence of the clergy, thus repaying them in a measure for their ready indorsement of his usurpation. However, the prerogatives of the civil power were not forgotten; there was no such

¹ It may be observed also that the restrictive laws which the manœuvring of the clerical party was largely instrumental in evoking from the Prussian government, had their parallel in Roman Catholic countries. The Austrian ecclesiastical laws of 1874 fell little short of the Prussian May laws in their assertion of civil prerogatives; indeed, in some points, the former transcended the latter. They led, however, to no considerable contest, since their execution was not vigorously pressed.

sweeping surrender to the Church as was implied in the Austrian concordat; and Napoleon was regarded at Rome as a somewhat doubtful though necessary ally.

The Spanish government, during the struggle with the Carlists which followed the accession of Isabella (1833), grieved the heart of the Pope by confiscating much church property. But partial amends were made. Isabella obtained the recognition of the Pope, and his Holiness was gratified in 1851 by the concluding of a concordat, framed according to his notion of the proper relations of kingdoms to the Roman See.

This review conducts us to the Syllabus of 1864, which gives us, as was indicated, the features of the modern papacy in its reactionary phases. It is a list of eighty errors which had been reproved in papal allocutions, encyclicals, and other communications, and which Pius IX. wished to signalize before the eyes of the faithful as branded with the apostolic censures. Among the things specified as errors are the following. Strictures upon old scholastic methods and principles;¹ the free choice of one's religion in the exercise of reason;² the exclusion of force from the proper instrumentalities of the Church;³ the separation of Church and State;⁴ the expediency of tolerating any other than the Roman Catholic

¹ The method and principles by which the old scholastic doctors cultivated theology are no longer suitable to the demands of the age and the progress of science (No. 13).

² Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason (15).

³ The Church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power (24).

⁴ The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church (55).

religion ;¹ the propriety of allowing non-Catholics the public exercise of their worship ;² the affirmation that popes and ecumenical councils have exceeded the limits of their power ;³ denial of the binding force of the Trent prescription on the form of solemnizing marriage ;⁴ the assertion that a civil contract, without the sacrament, can constitute valid marriage ;⁵ the theory that public schools should be freed from ecclesiastical authority, should be under civil direction, and should not have the Catholic faith included in their course of study.⁶

¹ In the present day, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship (77).

² It has been wisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship (78).

³ The Roman pontiffs and ecumenical councils have exceeded the limits of their power, have usurped the rights of princes, and have even committed errors in defining matters of faith and morals (23).

⁴ The form of solemnizing marriage prescribed by the said council [of Trent], under penalty of nullity, does not bind in cases where the civil law has appointed another form, and where it decrees that this new form shall effectuate a valid marriage (71.)

⁵ A merely civil contract may, among Christians, constitute a true marriage ; and it is false, either that the marriage contract between Christians is always a sacrament, or that the contract is null if the sacrament be excluded (73).

⁶ The best theory of civil society requires that popular schools, open to children of all classes, and, generally, all public institutes intended for instruction in letters and philosophy, and for conducting the education of the young, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority, government, and interference, and should be fully subject to the civil and political power, in conformity with the will of rulers and the prevalent opinions of the age (47). This system of instructing youth, which consists in separating it from the Catholic faith and from the power of the Church, and in teaching exclusively, or at least primarily, the knowledge of natural things and the earthly ends of social life alone, may be approved by Catholics (48).

Evidently we have here the very essence of the mediæval system. Translated into a positive form, the Syllabus teaches that the Popes have always kept within the just limits of their power, even when claiming the right to dethrone princes; that religious liberty is pernicious license; and that civil governments indulge in an impious usurpation when they attempt to manage education, or to prescribe aught respecting the conditions of marriage. No wonder that one and another Roman Catholic writer, not wishing to put modern civilization entirely under the ban, has been tempted to extenuate the meaning of the Syllabus on a number of points, and in particular to relieve its sombre proscription of the maxims of religious freedom. But, as was amply shown by Gladstone in controversy with Manning and Newman, no whitewashing expedient can hide the original tint of the document.¹ The proper sense of the Syllabus, unambiguous in itself, is too well supported by outside evidences to allow it to be interpreted away. Among these evidences is the version of Schrader, accompanied by a commendatory letter of the Pope. In this version, which turns the negations of the Syllabus into positive teachings, there is no amelioration of its significance. Its reprobation of religious freedom stands unobscured. But a still more authentic commentary is supplied in the acts of the Pope. His canonizing of the inquisitor Arbues was certainly no indication of affection for the principles of religious tolerance. Other acts of his testify more directly, if not more emphatically. Among the complaints preferred by him against the Spanish government in an allocution of the year 1855

¹ *Vaticanism: an Answer to Replies and Reproofs*, 1875.

was the granting of toleration for non-Roman worship. Similarly in 1863 he specified the establishment of freedom of worship as one of the grounds of the annulling sentence which he issued against the proceedings of the government of New Grenada. In an allocution of June 22, 1868, he declared null and void fundamental laws of Austria which had been passed in the preceding December, and which established, among other items of rational liberty, freedom of the press, of religious belief, and of religious profession.¹ In fact, it is as plain as the day that Pius IX. wished to check the current bearing Roman Catholic governments towards the concession of religious freedom, and that the Syllabus was meant to contribute to this obstructive end.

A very general conviction has prevailed that the Vatican Council would have formally sanctioned the Syllabus, had it been favored with the needful opportunity to complete its programme. That document, however, is sufficiently binding without the conciliar sanction. The slighting references to its authority which appear in Newman's "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk" are exceptional, and very likely would have helped to consign that astonishing treatise to the Index had not the author's singular position made the censure too costly.² The Pope's own conception of the authority of the Syllabus admitted no such discount. If his words

¹ Gladstone, *Vaticanism*.

² Döllinger knew perfectly the current at Rome when he said: "Had Newman written in French, Italian, or Latin, several of his books would now be standing in the Index." (Letter to Professor Michelis, May 1, 1879.) We think however, that he should have added a second condition, namely, the injurious scandal which a committal of the said writings to the Index would have brought upon the Romanizing party in England.

were truly reported, he said in 1867 to the assembled bishops: "In the encyclical of 1864, and in that which is called the Syllabus, I declared to the world the dangers which threaten society, and I condemned the falsehoods which assail its life. That act I now confirm in your presence, and I lay it again before you as the rule of your teaching."¹ Liberatore takes it as a matter of course that any one who accepts the Vatican decrees must give full assent to the condemnations of the Syllabus, as being the utterances of infallible lips.² Curci, while interested to moderate the force of the Syllabus, and claiming that it would be less of a fault to hold some of the propositions therein than others, inasmuch as the writings in which they were originally censured were of unequal weight, still concludes that "he would fall into error and be guilty of a certain offence against faith proper, who should pertinaciously adhere to one of the proscribed propositions."³ Hergenröther, though allowing that not all the propositions in the Syllabus are condemned as specifically *heretical*, ranks them nevertheless among *false and perverse opinions* which "must not be held or maintained."⁴ This we believe to be the least which any representative man in the Romish communion would dare to assert. It is certainly the least that could be claimed without coming into conflict with a declaration of Leo XIII.⁵ But

¹ Manning, True Story of Vatican Council, p. 47.

² La Chiesa e lo Stato, p. 389.

³ Il Moderno Dissidio tra la Chiesa e l' Italia, pp. 112, 113.

⁴ Catholic Church and Christian State, i. 207.

⁵ He says, in his encyclical concerning the Christian Constitution of States, 1886: "Pius IX., as opportunity offered, noted many false opin-

practically what more could the extreme zealot desire? Have Roman Catholics such consciences that an open door is left for anything which is branded as *false* or *perverse*, provided only it is not formally defined to be *heretical*? Are they justified in cultivating such consciences? If not, they can never harbor for a moment, in their character of Roman Catholics, one of the eighty propositions in the Syllabus. No more than Pius IX. can they, as consistent Roman Catholics, reconcile themselves with modern civilization.

Though the Vatican decrees make no formal mention of the Syllabus, they undoubtedly serve to strengthen its authority. They have a retroactive force, investing with the majesty of indubitable truth every *ex cathedra* utterance of the Popes on questions of faith and morals, and requiring reverent submission to every distinct requisition of theirs even in other matters, since their administrative authority allows of no appeal. From this standpoint it is easy to see that the Vatican deccres have a serious bearing upon the relation of ecclesiastical to civil authority. They shut out forever the possibility of any aristocratic or Gallican construction of papal decrees as opposed to the absolutist, and seal as authoritative such a manifesto as the bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII. It is true that this famous document had already received the concurrence of the Fifth Lateran Council. But the ecumenical character of this council, which was essentially a delegation of the Italian episcopate, has not been reckoned on all hands as indis-

ions which had begun to be of great strength, and afterward ordered them to be collected together in order that in so great a complex of errors Catholics might have something which, without stumbling, they might follow."

putable. The Vatican Council served therefore by its decrees to place the *Unam Sanctam* in an unequivocal light. To one acknowledging those decrees it is undoubtedly authoritative; for its *ex cathedra* character is allowed to be manifest. Now this bull, as was shown in the proper connection, reduces the civil power, in relation to the ecclesiastical, to complete servitude.¹ This is acknowledged by some Roman Catholic writers who have the hardihood to say that this is the normal arrangement. Others, influenced by their environment and deprecating scandal, have attempted so to interpret the bull as to secure a less ultra conclusion. But their effort has only resulted in a strained and faulty logic. Manning's exposition, for example, amounts to little more than a juggle with the term *spiritual*.² He thinks it worth while to argue that what Boniface VIII. claimed was *spiritual* not temporal authority, just as if it makes any difference what name is given to the authority which vaunts unqualified supremacy over the civil power and asserts the right to order at will how its sword shall be used. Hergenröther's procedure is not many degrees better.³ He is inclined to limit the infallibility of the bull to the concluding sentence, which is in the form of a definition. Now it is certainly a little mechanical to suppose the pontifical afflatus to fall short in one sentence and to be absolutely plenary in the next. More-

¹ See Mediæval Church, pp. 339–341. It may be noticed that the bull *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, issued by Paul IV. in 1559, though it is in form rather disciplinary than dogmatic, implies the same assumptions as are dogmatically affirmed in the *Unam Sanctam*.

² The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance.

³ Catholic Church and Christian State, p. 31.

over, even if strict infallibility is not asserted for every clause in the body of the document, its essential tenor — which is the thing of moment — cannot be challenged without a most palpable ineptitude. For in the concluding definition Boniface speaks of subjection to the Roman pontiff as indispensable to salvation.¹ What is the scope or kind of subjection which is meant? Evidently this question cannot be answered agreeably to the thought of the Pope except by reference to the foregoing part of the bull. To discard this reference is therefore just equivalent to saying that the definition of Boniface VIII. is authoritative and infallible only when taken in a sense different from that which he intended. Such makeshifts are failures. No honest escape has been found or can be found, in the light of the Vatican decrees, from the theoretical position that the civil power is anything more than an instrument subordinate to the spiritual sovereignty in the Pope. And from this it follows, of course, that civil allegiance is wholly secondary to that which is owed to the Roman pontiff. As a safeguard against interference with the former, the most that can be urged is the probable good behavior of the Popes. But this is a plea which does not carry full rational persuasion. Even as put by so ingenious a rhetorician as Newman, it leaves much to be desired.² As a pledge against future mistakes in administration he can offer nothing more satisfactory than a catalogue of enormous blunders in the papal doings of former times, and such a spirit in the present age as, on papal

¹ "We declare, say, and define that to be subject to the Roman pontiff is for every human being altogether necessary to salvation."

² Letter to the Duke of Norfolk.

principles, must be regarded refractory, abnormal, and to be abolished at the earliest possible date by giving the rising generation a pure Ultramontane tuition. How utopian sounds the expectation that Popes will always deal wisely and righteously with civil governments and their subjects, when we are informed that various Popes have given themselves up to "luxury and a pagan kind of Christianity"; or when we are confronted with such a chain of fallibility as appears in the following interrogatories: "Was St. Peter infallible on that occasion at Antioch when St. Paul withheld him? Was St. Victor infallible when he separated from his communion the Asiatic churches? or Liberius when in like manner he excommunicated Athanasius? And, to come to later times, was Gregory XIII. when he had a medal struck in honor of the Bartholomew massacre? or Paul IV. in his conduct towards Elizabeth? or Sixtus V. when he blessed the Armada? or Urban VIII. when he persecuted Galileo?" Newman offers us here truly a poor basis of confidence in the future good conduct of Popes. Especially do we need a better guaranty against acts of arbitrariness and usurpation, if criticism is to be hushed, as it has been in recent years, and nothing but the voice of servile submission and intemperate adulation is to reach the ears of the Pope.

As an indication of the manner in which a representative of Romish orthodoxy treats the relation of papal to civil authority, when writing in a congenial atmosphere, we may take the statements of Liberatore in the *Civiltà Cattolica*.¹ With him there is no indulging of sidelong

¹ We quote from the articles as collected under the title "La Chiesa e lo Stato," 2d edit., 1872.

or timorous glances toward the bull *Unam Sanctam*; it is infallible teaching from beginning to end.¹ The authority of the Roman pontiff, he maintains, is the very authority of Christ.² Every baptized person is more thoroughly a subject of the Pope than he is of any other earthly ruler.³ The tribunal of the Church, whose authority is summed up in the Pope, is superior to that of the State, and can revise its causes.⁴ If the Pope should condemn the laws of a country, it would be a sure token that those laws are iniquitous, and ought to be condemned.⁵ His right of inspection and judgment extends, at least indirectly, to every species of laws,⁶ and to the entire political order.⁷

As respects the management of education, Liberatore leaves nothing to the State as against the Church, which means that papal discretion is the supreme and ultimate standard in the whole matter. While he emphasizes the

¹ Pp. 13, 23, 99, 266, 421.

² L'autorità del Pontefice è l'autorità stessa di Cristo, di cui egli qui in terra tiene le veci, e prosegue l'opera nella santificazione e nel reggimento dei fedeli (p. 40).

³ Ogni persona battezzata è più suddita del Papa, che non sia di qualsivoglia altro governante terreno (p. 39).

⁴ Il tribunale della Chiesa è più alto del civile. Ora il tribunale superiore può rivedere le cause dell' inferiore ; ma l' inferiore niun modo può rivedere le cause del superiore (p. 46).

⁵ Rispondiamo che se il Papa condannasse le leggi fundamentali d' un paese, sarebbe segno manifesto che quelle leggi sono inique e da condannarsi (p. 367).

⁶ Regulations of military affairs and imposts, though purely temporal in themselves, may be injurious to the spiritual good of the people, and in that case they can be annulled by ecclesiastical authority (p. 111).

⁷ I teologi insegnano che il Pontefice, per ciò stesso che è Vicario di Cristo nel reggimento della Chiesa, ha potestà almeno indiretta sullo stesso ordine politico, a cui provvede il principe temporale (p. 422).

rights of parents over the education of their offspring, he indicates beyond a shadow of ambiguity what this amounts to in Romish phraseology; namely, a circumlocution for the statement that the Church has a plenary and indivisible right to supervise education, parents being bound to receive upon this subject the guidance of the Church as the infallible mistress of truth.¹ If the State cannot be persuaded to fulfil its true function of simply serving the Church, then the best that it can do is to leave a free course to education.

On the subject of religious freedom, as on that of education, the statements of Liberatore are entirely conformable to the letter of the Syllabus. He approves a pontifical definition of liberty of conscience, which sets it forth not as man's right but his madness.² While he allows that the conditions of some countries may render it expedient to tolerate other forms of religion than the Roman Catholic, he insists that the proscription of dissent through pains and privations is wholesome where it is feasible, and so much the more necessary, as gross minds, which form the majority in every country, are less impressed by the thought of future pains than by exposure to present suffering.³ It is a part of the ser-

¹ Chi dirà che la persona umana dal lato dell' intelligenza sia suddita dello Stato? L' intelligenza non è soggetta, se non al vero. E però è soggetta a Dio, Vero sussistente e fonte d' ogni altro vero. Come soggetta a Dio, è soggetta altresì alla Chiesa, che del vero divino è infallibile maestra, e da Dio stesso ha ricevuta missione di promulgarlo alle genti. Dalla Chiesa dunque può e dee ricevere indirizzo il padre nel formare l' intelligenza del suo figliuolo; ma in niuna guisa è tenuto a riceverlo dallo Stato, che nè per natura nè per grazia è costituito organo infallibile di verità (p. 348).

² Non diritto ma *delirio* dell' uomo (p. 49).

³ Pp. 53, 54, 70-76.

vice which the State owes to the Church to use material force against those who are contumacious in respect of religion.¹

If we pass to the utterances of Leo XIII., we shall not find the teaching of Pius IX. and the *Civiltà Cattolica* in any wise belied as to its essential tenor. The same views are brought to the front, and industriously urged by the later Pope, though in general he has impressed the Christian world as being dowered with greater moderation and breadth than his predecessor. In the encyclical of January 10, 1890, he thus defines the obedience due to himself:—

“To decide what doctrines have been divinely delivered pertains to the Church in its teaching function, to which God has given the custody and interpretation of His oracles. But the supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman pontiff. As therefore a union of minds requires perfect agreement in one faith, so it requires that wills be entirely subject and obedient to the Church and to the Roman pontiff, as to God.

“No one can serve two masters. If the one is obeyed, the other must of necessity be discarded. Now as to which should be preferred, no one ought to doubt.

¹ Pp. 94–97. Hergenröther, while speaking somewhat more guardedly than Liberatore, also shows loyalty to the Syllabus by condemning religious tolerance, except where the conditions make it impracticable to enforce uniformity of worship. “The authorization of every form of worship,” he writes, “is a grave injustice in purely Catholic countries, like Spain and South America. The unity of the nation in faith is too great a benefit for the State to be sacrificed without necessity; and where only one religion exists, the State has duties toward it, and should protect it as far as possible from attacks and divisions.” (*Catholic Church and Christian State*, ii. 359, 360.)

Evidently it is a crime to abandon obedience to God for the sake of satisfying men; it is impious to break the laws of Jesus Christ that one may obey magistrates, or, under pretext of conserving civil right, to violate the rights of the Church. . . . If the laws of a commonwealth are openly at variance with divine right, if they involve any injury to the Church, or contradict religious duties, or violate the authority of Jesus Christ in the supreme pontiff, then truly to resist is duty, to obey is crime.

“Both that which ought to be believed and that which ought to be done the Church by divine right teaches, and in the Church the supreme pontiff. Wherefore the pontiff ought to be able to judge, in accordance with his authority, what the divine oracles contain, what doctrines accord and what disagree with them; and in like manner to show what things are honorable, what are base.

“It belongs to the pontiff not only to rule the Church, but in general so to order the actions of Christian citizens, that they may be in suitable accord with the hope of obtaining eternal salvation.”

On the subject of religious freedom, Leo XIII. refers to the encyclical of Gregory XVI., issued in 1832, and the *Syllabus of Errors*, published by Pius IX. “From these decisions of the Popes,” he says, “it is clearly to be understood that it is a crime for states to observe nowhere the duties of religion, or to treat in the same way different kinds of religion; that the uncontrolled right of thinking and publicly proclaiming one’s thoughts is not inherent in the rights of citizens, nor in any sense to be placed among those things which are worthy of

favor or patronage.”¹ This seems to stamp a policy like that of the United States as criminal. The Pope, however, allows that such a policy, though in theory it is thoroughly reprehensible, may be excused, provided it is adopted under a species of compulsion. “The Church,” he says, “judges it not lawful that the various kinds of divine worship should have the same right as the true religion: still, it does not therefore condemn those governors of states who, for the sake of acquiring some great good, or preventing some great ill, patiently bear with manners and customs, so that each kind of religion has its place in the State.”

And so the strain continues. Popes and Jesuits assure us that the natural order ought to be thoroughly subject to the supernatural; that the supernatural order in this world is identical with the Roman Catholic Church; that in this Church all authority is vested in the hierarchy; and that the prerogatives of the hierarchy are summed up in the Pope. This is the substance of their contention. Nor can it be expected that they will abate their claim so long as the prestige of numbers gives it the least shadow of respectability, though historical criticism punctures it through and through, and though millions of souls, putting on the graces of Christ and marching toward the heavenly kingdom without the consent of Pope or hierarchy, make clearly manifest how all this high-flying assumption is vanity and falsehood.

The indirect sovereignty over temporal affairs which the Popes claim in virtue of their spiritual authority might seem to give them a sufficient sphere in the natural order. But their own judgment is decidedly and

¹ Encyclical of 1886 concerning the Christian Constitution of States.

tenaciously to the contrary. Upon nothing have they insisted more emphatically than upon their right to a direct temporal rule, or their character as civil heads of a specific territory ; and against nothing for the last generation have they inveighed more bitterly than against the wresting of this territory from their hands.

It is to be allowed that the Popes had an unequivocal legal title to their principality, and that consequently the invasion of that title partook of the nature of revolution. But, on the other hand, it must be confessed that the revolution was so far driven on by natural, not to say normal, motives and aspirations, that criticism is properly abashed in its presence. It is not easy to challenge the providential character of a work back of which were two such ideals as constitutional liberty and national unity.

It has been noticed that the downfall of Napoleon I. restored the old map of Italy, the principal divisions being the Lombardo-Venetian territory under Austria ; Piedmont together with Savoy and Genoa ; Tuscany ; the duchies of Parma and Modena ; the Papal States ; and the kingdom of Naples and Sicily. In all these divisions of the peninsula, the superior strength of Austria gave her a decided influence. The fact itself of this domination by an essentially foreign power was obnoxious to patriotic feeling. This however, was the smaller half of the grievance. Austrian influence was steadily used for the cause of repression. A movement on the part of the people in any section of Italy for securing a share in the government was a signal for the intervention of Austria. Her arms were the principal agency in putting down the popular uprising of 1848, and in

sweeping away the newly published constitutions. The victory, however, was a costly one, as it greatly intensified hatred of the Austrian yoke in the breasts of a large part of the Italian people. It was subject also to a great discount from the fact that one important example of constitutional rule was left in Italy. Piedmont, as represented by Charles Albert, and then by Victor Emmanuel (after 1849), faithfully adhered to the constitution granted in 1848. The consequence was that liberal spirits began to attach their hopes to this state. Piedmont became in fact the standard-bearer of the two-fold cause of constitutional rule and national unity. Her participation in the Crimean war, as it gave her a right to be heard in the Congress of Paris, was utilized in the interest of her ascendancy in Italy. Cavour skilfully improved the occasion to set forth the abnormal condition of Italian polities. The measure of sympathy which was thus secured from the great powers served as a safeguard against unfriendly interposition. At the same time the way was opened to a special alliance with France. Napoleon III., being dissatisfied with the manner in which the Pope, though sustained in his temporal rule by French arms, seemed rather to consult the pleasure of Austria than that of France, and hoping also to make some substantial gain from the venture, joined Piedmont in 1859 in a war against Austria. The immediate result of the brief struggle was the addition of Lombardy to Piedmont. The opportunity was also afforded for the annexation of Tuscany, Parma, and Modena; and this occurred in 1860. In the same year an insurrection in the southern kingdom and the general dissatisfaction of the people with the despotic rule of

the Bourbon sovereign facilitated the acquisition of this kingdom, together with Umbria and some other portions of the Papal States. Only Veniee and Rome were now excluded from the Italian kingdom. The war between Prussia and Austria in 1866 opened the door to the admission of the former, and the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, as it necessitated the recall of the French troops who sustained the Pope's sovereignty, made it easy to take possession of the latter. Since Rome could but be regarded as the natural capital of Italy, since also respect for the claim of the Pope had been deeply wounded by his alliance with Austrian despotism, and moreover the subsistence of an independent state in the heart of its territory would involve serious dangers for the new Italian kingdom, the occupation of the city and its incorporation with the realm took place with spontaneous decision.

Though the Pope was left without a kingdom, he was not left in the position of a subject. By the Law of Papal Guarantees, which the Italian Parliament enacted in 1871, the person of the Pope was declared to be sacred and inviolable, and he was vested with the full custody of his palaces, so that no official might enter them without his consent. It was provided also that there should be no interference with the spiritual functions of the pontiff, and that no ecclesiastics serving as his ministers in this order of functions should be accountable for their acts. As if to compensate for the temporal loss of the papacy by an increase of spiritual prerogatives, it was stipulated that the government should renounce its right of nominating to the greater benefices, should not require an oath of allegiance from

the bishops, and should demand no form of governmental assent for the publication and execution of acts of ecclesiastical authority. On the other hand, it was ordained that no aid could be claimed from the State for enforcing acts of spiritual discipline, and that these acts should be without effect if detrimental to public order or contrary to the laws. The State also maintained a certain right over ecclesiastical property.¹

The Law of Papal Guarantees was by no means a bilateral contract. It was simply an expression of what the Italian government considered a just policy under the new conditions. The Pope from his standpoint deemed it impossible to make any terms, or in any way to recognize the legitimacy of the Italian kingdom. And this uncompromising attitude has been steadily maintained. Occasionally an eminent ecclesiastic has ventured to intimate that the Pope might accept the fact of Italian unity, and enter into friendly relations with the government. Thus Curci argued that it is reasonable to conclude that the temporal power has fulfilled its mission, and that one should not look for the restoration of a past which Providence has destroyed.² More recently Bishop Bonomelli has spoken earnest words for the reconciliation of Church and State. He declares that the strong attachment of the overwhelming majority of Italian citizens to the cause of national unity makes it impossible to hope for the restoration of the Pope's temporal power, except through the medium of external force; and that a restoration accomplished in this way would be a doubtful gain in the

¹ See the lucid narrative of J. W. Probyn, Italy, 1815-1878.

² Il Moderno Dissidio tra la Chiesa e l'Italia, 1878.

face of the passionate hatred toward the papacy which it would elicit from all zealous patriots.¹ But no token has been given that such counsels are tolerated in the Vatican. The necessity of the temporal power as a support of pontifical freedom and majesty is set forth continually as the orthodox theory. To be sure this necessity has not been given the rank of a dogma; but a denial of it is regarded at the papal court as a species of disloyalty, and Liberatore has argued that all faithful Catholics must credit it with the weight which belongs to a solemn decision in morals.² For more than a score of years, accordingly, the Italian people have been compelled to hear their government spoken of by the Pope and the hierarchy as an unrighteous and usurping force. An encyclical of Leo XIII., addressed to the bishops, clergy, and people of Italy in 1890, teems with bitter complaints. He describes the government as an exponent of Masonic impiety, exhibiting its hostility to true religion by limiting its public manifestations, proclaiming civil marriage, abolishing monastic orders, assuming control of charitable funds, and secularizing education.

Evidently such a conflict between patriotic interests

¹ *Roma e l' Italia e la Realtà delle Cose*, 1889.

² *La Chiesa e lo Stato*, pp. 443, 444. Cardinal Manning claims no less, as may be seen from these three propositions: "The temporal power of the Pope is ordained of God. It is the productive and sustaining cause of Christian Europe. Its dissolution would be the dissolution of Christian Europe." (*Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ*, 1880.) It is understood that a definition of the necessity of the temporal power was a part of the papal programme for the Vatican Council, and would have been promulgated but for the premature dispersion of the assembly. So states a Roman Catholic writer, S. M. Brandi (*North American Review*, December, 1892).

and ecclesiasticism cannot be favorable to the latter. In fact, alienation from the Romish Church, more or less pronounced, has spread through no inconsiderable portion of the higher ranks. Half of the men, we are told, do not go to mass, and in some of the cities nine tenths of them keep clear of the confessional.¹ Even the Pope allows that the faith is endangered, though of course he charges the guilty responsibility upon the secular power.² Professor Mariano speaks of the vein of religious ideality in the minds of the people as being dried up, and declares that the cultured classes rest generally upon a foundation of indifferentism and scepticism, however great may be the number of individuals in the list of honorable exceptions. He finds the cause, however, not merely in the dissidence between State and Church, but also in the excess of perverse mechanism in the Romish religion, or its extensive adulteration with the elements of a magical and idolatrous naturalism.³

The Pope, it was noticed, enumerates the secularization of education among the sins of the Italian government. He could scarcely have been oblivious, however, of the fact that this sin is a somewhat besetting one for modern governments. The policy of secularization has obtained in France. A beginning was made under the ministry of Jules Ferry, in 1880, toward limiting the

¹ Roma e l' Italia e la Realtà delle Cose, Pensieri di un Prelato Italiano; Toscanelli, Religione e Patria Osteggiate dal Papa.

² Sembra incredibile, ma è pur vero: siam giunti a tanto da dover temere per questa nostra Italia la perdita della fede. (Encyclical, Oct. 15, 1890.)

³ Il Pensiero Religioso in Italia, Discorso tenuto allo IX^a Conferenza Internazionale dell' Aleanza Evangelica, Firenze, 1891.

ecclesiastical control of education. By the laws passed under the ministry of Paul Bert, in 1886, instruction in the public schools was made exclusively secular. In Belgium a like plan was inaugurated in 1879, but the strength of clericalism in that country was so great as largely to neutralize its effect in practice. A system of rival schools was at once patronized, and parents under pain of forfeiting absolution were required to withhold their children from the government institutions. The expedient of independent or self-supporting schools has also conserved a large share of school training in France to ecclesiastical direction.

Amid the hostilities awakened by the Syllabus and the Vatican decrees, not a few have hoped that an occasion for a better feeling toward the papacy would be supplied by the socialistic agitation of the times. The perils involved in the more radical type of socialism ought, as they have argued, to open the eyes of civil rulers to the value of an oracle which can utter sound principles with an authoritative voice. And in fact the conservative views known to be entertained by the Pope and the hierarchy upon the subject of property, and which have been given expression in the encyclical of Leo XIII. (May 15, 1891), tend to foster a certain appreciation for the practical service which may be rendered by ecclesiastical authority. Still, all men who know the modern world know that problems of social science cannot truly be settled by fiat, any more than astronomical problems could be settled by that method in the days of Galileo. Where the Pope reasons well his words will find a response, as will those of any other prominent person-

age under the like condition. Many, indeed, may not inquire narrowly into the merits of his deliverances ; but the company that will accept his teaching on sheer authority, whether it be larger or smaller, is not the company upon which in the long run the march of events principally depends. Governments cannot be expected to ignore this fact. Moreover, they are instinctively jealous of an infallible vicegerent, who logically, as being confronted only by inferiors, must seek to make his will dominant over all. One and another ruler may venture to use the agency of the Pope in bridging over a temporary exigency ; but antipathy to theocratic sovereignty, and the impossibility of sharing the field with it on anything like equal terms, must ere-long react against such an alliance. However gratifying, therefore, the socialist agitation may have been to the advocates of high papal claims, it is not likely to afford them the means of any large or durable triumph.¹

¹ Socialism of a radical cast may be regarded as historically connected with the French Revolution. At any rate, it sounds like an echo of the faith — characteristic of the leading actors of that crisis — in the possibility of ushering in a golden age by management. The banishing of human ills by social appliances is the great article of its creed. Saint Simon (1760–1825) began the succession of French socialists in the present century. The industrial state directed by men of science was in his view the proper means of realizing the perfectibility of the race. In the end he came to value the function of religion, and admitted so much of Christianity as he conceived to be in harmony with modern science, thus setting an example to Comte, though not pushing his views here into any such caricature as is given in the detailed system of the Positivist philosopher. On the basis of Saint Simon, Bazard and Enfantin went forward to gather a school or socialistic sect. The latter was an intemperate zealot, who carried socialistic doctrine into an unclean regime, wherein the

flesh was placed on an equality with the spirit, and marriage was stripped of its sanctity. This was too much for Bazard, who had no wish to sacrifice morality. In the plan of Fourier (1772–1837), which would divide up society into communistic associations, a kind of regulated license took the place of marriage. This phase, however, was largely discarded by his disciples, their attention being centred upon the economic features of the scheme. In Proudhon (1809–1865), with his definition of property as “robbery,” and of God as “the evil,” socialism of a fanatical and demagogical type found an exponent.

CHAPTER III.

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

I. — GENERAL SURVEY OF THE RELIGIOUS FIELD IN ENGLAND.

IN the early part of the nineteenth century we find tokens of a different spirit in England from that which confronted us at the beginning of the preceding century. A larger current of vital piety is apparent. Sermons no longer fall mainly under the category of moral essays; doctrine and experience are emphasized. The Evangelical School holds a prominent place in the Established Church, and a large proportion of Dissenters still harbor the tendencies begotten by the Great Revival. Various bodies follow the example which Carey and the Baptists supplied in 1792, and the work of foreign missions expands rapidly. In philosophic thought the empiricism of Locke retains but a disputed place; the claims of intuition begin to be asserted. Poetry also breathes a new inspiration. A cold perfection no longer satisfies; warmth and sentiment are desired; and instead of the school of Pope we have Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, and others of the group which adorned the first quarter of the century.

One factor contributing to the rise of the new type of poetry was the influence of Germany then beginning to make itself felt in England. To this factor is also to be

attributed in some measure one of the most noteworthy developments within the English Church in recent times. Whatever indigenous causes may have contributed to its growth, the Broad Church movement has received a perceptible impulse and bias from German philosophy and criticism. In helping directly to this movement these factors have contributed indirectly to a very different one. No doubt, it would be going beyond warrant to style the extreme High Church movement, known as Tractarianism, a simple reaction against Broad Church theories. The mixed standards of the English Church contain some ingredients which are suited to serve as the standing basis of a High Church development, and such a development, once started with special vigor, naturally is with difficulty brought to a halt. Still, Tractarianism appears measurably as a reaction, at least in its primary stage. Among the causes which urged on its originators was an already existing Broad Church movement, an initial tendency to a more latitudinarian or liberal school than had as yet obtained a footing in the Establishment. Men like Thirlwall, who made an opening for German criticism by his translation of Schleiermacher's essay on Luke's Gospel, Coleridge, who was noticeably affected by German speculation, and the early Oriel School, represented by Whately, Hampden, and Thomas Arnold, though by no means inclined to great laxity in their theological views, gave sufficient tokens of independent thinking to awaken some apprehension in conservative minds.

Tractarianism was also a reaction against the tendency of the Evangelical School. By exalting above measure a certain line of gospel truths, this school had fallen

into a species of theological narrowness. Hence was a valid ground of criticism, though otherwise the Evangelicals in the early part of the century had the special merit of embodying a large fraction of the earnest piety and missionary zeal of the Establishment. At the same time they were quite as much in sympathy with Dissenters of similar doctrinal views as with the opposing school in their own communion. Accordingly they were regarded by High Churchmen as guilty of a species of disloyalty to the Anglican Establishment.

In a conspicuous degree Tractarianism was a reaction against political liberalism, or what was esteemed to have that character. It was a Tory protest against a reform movement which gave political equality to the Dissenters by abolishing, in 1828, the Corporation and Test Acts, secured Roman Catholic emancipation in 1829, and sought through a series of acts in the following years to mend abuses in both Church and State. Naturally those who did not go with the tide resented Parliamentary interference with the affairs of the Church, and began to agitate against the Erastian theory of ecclesiastical government.

With the progress of the century the legislation of 1828 was supplemented by additional acts in favor of Dissenters. Compulsory church rates were abolished in 1868. The exclusive right of the clergy of the Church of England to conduct burials in consecrated ground was taken away in 1880. By the abolition of religious tests in 1854 and 1856, the way to certain degrees at Oxford and Cambridge was opened to Dissenters. Later acts (1871, 1882) made Dissenters eligible to nearly all university honors, the headships and fellowships of the

colleges (with few exceptions) being made accessible to them. Progress was also made toward a non-partisan basis in relation to education. "By the education act of 1870 the State entirely separated itself from all concern in the religious instruction of elementary schools, tolerating and accepting all schools indifferently in which the secular instruction was found sufficient, and arranging for the establishment of rate-paid Board schools, which were to be purely undenominational."¹ More recently a provision in the direction of free education has been added to this scheme.

The grief to High Church feeling which may have been caused by this abridgment of the special privileges of the Establishment has been offset in some measure by the revival of Convocation, which awoke out of its long slumber in 1852. A more equivocal consolation was afforded by the relaxation, in 1865, of the terms of clerical subscription.

A happy and creditable breadth of spirit was exhibited by Convocation in connection with the revision of the English Bible, which was projected in 1870. The motion to invite eminent scholars of all religious bodies to co-operate in the great undertaking encountered but moderate opposition. "It is no secret that Dr. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, Dr. Alford, Dean of Canterbury, and Dr. Stanley, Dean of Westminster, were most active in originating the revision, and to their influence the catholic character of the undertaking is chiefly to be ascribed."²

While the proprieties of worship have been a special

¹ Perry, History of the English Church, Third Period, p. 535.

² Stoughton, Religion in England from 1800 to 1850, ii. 395.

theme in certain circles, the most eccentric methods of Christian work have been developed by the Salvation Army, which arose in connection with the mission in East London, in the years following 1873, and spread rapidly over a great part of the Christian world.¹ These methods too have been met with not a little of charitable consideration. A new sense of the desperate condition of the unevangelized masses in the crowded centres of population has taken hold of the Church, and has quenched much of the fastidiousness over methods which otherwise would have been manifested. The ferment which is in progress respecting the needs, temporal and spiritual, of the unchurched multitudes of the great cities, is not the least among the hopeful signs of practical piety in this generation.

A reference to the colonial field is needed in a proper survey of the Anglican Establishment. The first colonial bishop was appointed in 1787, with Nova Scotia for his field. In 1793 the see of Quebec was founded, in 1814 that of Calcutta. Between 1850 and 1879 no less than forty-one bishoprics were instituted in the English colonial and missionary field.

II.—TRACTARIANISM, OR RITUALISM.

Tractarianism had its headquarters at Oxford, and its beginning in the year 1833. The circumstances under

¹ General Booth could thus write of his Army in 1890: "Its flag is now flying in thirty-four countries or colonies, where, under the leadership of nearly ten thousand men and women, whose lives are wholly given up to the work, it is holding some 49,800 religious meetings every week, attended by millions of persons, who ten years ago would have laughed at the idea of praying." (*In Darkest England, Appendix.*)

which it arose and the spirit with which it was inaugurated are well indicated by the words of one who was at the time in full sympathy with its aim. We quote from the account of William Palmer: "At the beginning of the summer of 1833, the Church in England and Ireland seemed destined to immediate desolation and ruin. We had seen, in 1828, the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, cutting away from the Church of England one of its ancient bulwarks, and evidencing a disposition to make concession to the clamor of its enemies. In the next year — the fatal year 1829 — we had seen the principle fully carried out, by the concession of what is called 'Roman Catholic emancipation,' — a measure which scattered to the winds public principle, public morality, public confidence." In this way, complains the writer, the security of the Church was endangered, its supervision being left in "the hands of a Parliament reckless of the high and sacred interests of religion, and now for the first time numbering by law among its members Romanists and Dissenters." The sacrifice of ten bishoprics in Ireland to gratify a Romish democracy, he argues, was a startling indication of what might be expected from the enemies of the Church with their enlarged opportunities to control legislation. "Nor was this," he says, "the worst. The prevailing spirit of innovation had begun to infect the Church itself. Writers had been at work for some time disseminating superficial and fanciful novelties on religious questions, disdaining all appeal to authority, and encouraging a taste for rationalizing theology. The publications of the author of 'The Natural History of Enthusiasm,' which went directly to the subversion of all existing religious

systems, as well amongst Dissenters as in the Church, had been unsuspectingly and greedily absorbed by the public mind. The theory of Church and State had been handled by adherents of a rationalizing school which had grown up at Oxford,—on various principles, indeed, but in such modes as to generate dissatisfaction with existing institutions. Elements thus prepared were stimulated into unnatural activity by political convulsions. We were overwhelmed with pamphlets on Church Reform. . . . Each sciolist presented his puny design for reconstructing this august temple built by no human hands. Such was the disorganization of the public mind, that Dr. Arnold of Rugby ventured to propose that all sects should be united by act of Parliament with the Church of England, on the principle of retaining all their distinctive errors and absurdities. . . . Pamphlets were in circulation recommending the abolition of the creeds (at least in public worship), and especially urging the expulsion of the Athanasian Creed.”¹

To meet the crisis, the writer of the above extracts conferred in 1833 with several zealous friends of the Church, such as Newman, Froude, Keble, Rose, and Percival. Organized effort was decided upon. The plan of an association was drawn up, and documents were circulated among clergy and laity soliciting their signature to declarations of attachment to the Church of England. Meanwhile the “Tracts for the Times,” which gave name to the movement, began to be issued. Mr. Palmer says that for a short time, approving the general

¹ A Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times, New York, 1843.

intent of these tracts, he assisted in their circulation ; but he soon became convinced that they were prepared with too little care, and were likely to have an unfavorable effect, so that he could no longer encourage their publication. They continued, however, to be issued till 1841, when the series came to an end, owing to the episcopal disapprobation — and perhaps also to the general outcry — called forth by the tract No. 90.

This tract, which was regarded as vaporizing away the natural sense of the Thirty-Nine Articles, was written by J. H. Newman. For some years, though receiving at the start an impetus from Keble and R. H. Froude, he was the real leader of the Oxford movement. E. B. Pusey, who became so identified with Tractarianism as to have his name wrought into a substitute term for the system, first gave his hearty co-operation in 1835.

The year 1841 may be regarded as the terminus of the first stage of Tractarianism. What characteristics had it exhibited up to that date ? The answer to this question may be summarized as follows : (1) An impatient attitude toward State control. (2) Immense emphasis upon apostolical succession and upon the sacraments, the validity of which was regarded as dependent upon that succession. (3) Hostility to certain doctrines characteristic of Protestantism, and approximation to certain tenets and maxims of Romanism.

As respects the first of these points, the Tractarians owed something to their familiarity with the writings of the Nonjurors. From the same quarter also they received a stimulus to a disparaging estimate of the English Reformation. “ To this source,” writes Palmer, “ it was easy to trace much of that jealousy of State inter-

ference, much of that assertion of the unlimited independence of the Church, and, above all, much of that unfavorable judgment of the English and Foreign Reformation, which so largely characterized the Tracts and other connected works. The Nonjurors, from whom their views were, perhaps unconsciously, borrowed, had been pressed by their opponents with precedents of civil interference in church matters at the period of the Reformation ; and their remedy too frequently was to assail and to vilify the Reformation itself. Their separation from the Established Church also led gradually to their discovery of various supposed defects in our Liturgy and institutions. Certain ceremonics which had been prescribed in the first Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI., and which had been subsequently omitted, were represented by several Nonjuring writers as essentials." It is only necessary to add to this statement that it became characteristic of Tractarianism to stigmatize the surrender of these ceremonies as an ill-advised concession to ultra Protestantism.

The importance of apostolical succession and of the sacraments is the favorite theme of the Tracts. In the advertisement to the first volume of these writings, the main object of the publication is declared to be the revival of Catholic teaching upon these subjects. Neglect in this direction, it is claimed, has taken many an awakened sinner from the Church and given him to the Dissenting preacher. "Had he been taught as a child, that the sacraments, not preaching, are the sources of divine grace ; that the apostolical ministry had a virtue in it which went out over the whole Church, when sought by the prayer of faith ; that fellowship with it was a gift

and a privilege as well as a duty,—we could not have so many wanderers from our fold.” The first Tract has this sentence: “I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built,—OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT.” Says Tract 4, “Why should we talk so much of an Establishment, and so little of our apostolical succession?” In Tract 35 we have the following: “A person not commissioned from the bishop may use the words of baptism, and sprinkle and bathe with water, *on earth*, but there is no promise from Christ that such a man shall admit souls to the *kingdom of Heaven*. A person not commissioned may break bread and pour out wine, and pretend to give the Lord’s Supper, but it can afford no comfort to any to receive it at his hands, because there is no warrant from Christ to lead communicants to suppose that while he does so here *on earth*, they will be partakers in the Savior’s heavenly body and blood. As for the person himself who takes upon himself without warrant to minister in holy things, he is all the while treading in the footsteps of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, whose awful punishment you can read of in the Book of Numbers.” The advertisement to the second volume of Tracts contains one of the most sweeping declarations of the sacramentalists’ theory: “We have almost embraced the doctrine, that God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies, that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplations, or (what is called) communion with God, in contradiction to the primitive view, according to which the Church and her sacraments are the ordained and direct visible means of conveying to the soul what is supernatural and unseen. For example,

would not most men maintain, on the first view of the subject, that to administer the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and insensible, however consistently pious and believing in their past lives, was a superstition? And yet both practices have the sanction of primitive usage. And does not this account for the prevailing indisposition to admit that baptism conveys regeneration? Indeed, this may be set down as the essence of sectarian doctrine, (however its mischief may be restrained or compensated in the case of individuals,) to consider faith, and not the sacraments, as the instrument of justification and other gospel gifts," whereas faith is only one among the conditions of receiving. The emphasis accorded to baptism as an external rite in the above extract is repeated in unmeasured terms in Tract 61. "Baptismal regeneration," it is there stated, "as connected with the incarnation of our blessed Lord, gives a depth to our Christian existence, an actualness to our union with Christ, a reality to our sonship to God, an interest in our Lord's glorified body at God's right hand, a joyousness amid the subduing of the flesh, an overwhelmingness to the dignity conferred on human nature, a solemnity to the communion of saints, who are the fulness of Him who filleth all in all, a substantiality to the indwelling of Christ, that to those who retain this truth the school that abandoned it must needs to appear to have sold their birthright." A like estimate appears in Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, where he says: "There are but two periods of absolute cleansing, baptism and the day of judgment." This means, if it means anything, that no degree of consecration and faith, no height of inward experience,

can give an assurance of the remission of sins equal to that which comes from the bare fact of baptism.

Tractarianism early exhibited an express hostility to some of the leading tenets of Protestantism. It took exceptions to the doctrine that the Scriptures are the sole and sufficient standard. While allowing that they contain every essential doctrine, it appealed to tradition for an authoritative interpretation, maintaining that the early Catholic fathers are not merely useful helps toward a right interpretation, but, as being exponents of apostolic tradition, are of decisive authority on points claiming their general agreement. Says Pusey: "We would take, not our own private and individual judgments, but that of the Universal Church, as attested by the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops."¹ The voice of the Universal Church, according to the same writer, can claim not merely the probability, but the certainty, of being in the right. A truly ecumenical council has never erred. Tract 45 intimates that the Reformers were wrong in resting their cause so entirely upon the Scriptures. "At the Reformation," it says, "the authority of the Church was discarded by the spirit then predominant among Protestants, and Scripture was considered the sole document both for ascertaining and proving our faith." Among the rules which Newman lays down for regulating private judgment are the following: "When the sense of Scripture, as interpreted by the reason of the individual, is contrary to the sense given to it by Catholic Antiquity, we ought to side with the latter. When Antiquity runs counter to the present Church in important matters, we must follow Antiquity;

¹ Letter to the Bishop of Oxford.

when in unimportant matters, we must follow the present Church. When the present Church speaks contrary to our private notions, and Antiquity is silent, or its decisions unknown to us, it is pious to sacrifice our own opinion to that of the Church.”¹ The same writer finds a practical reason for emphasizing the authority of the Church and of antiquity in the fact that “ Scripture is not so clear as to hinder ordinary persons, who read it for themselves, from being Sabellians, or Independents, or Wesleyans.” How very definite this decisive authority of antiquity is, appears clearly from the fact that Newman is not able to fix its limits to within several centuries. He says: “The termination of the period of purity cannot be fixed much earlier than the Council of Sardica, A. D. 347, nor so late as the second Nicene Council, which was held A. D. 787.”

The Tractarians diverged widely from the Reformation both as respects the conditions and the nature of justification. Newman in the ninetieth Tract writes: “We are justified by Christ alone, in that He has purchased the gift; by faith alone, in that faith asks for it; by baptism alone, for baptism conveys it; and by newness of heart alone, for newness of heart is the life of it.” This will probably strike most persons as assigning very much company to faith in its solitude as a medium of justification. But Newman reduces the scope and significance of faith still further; for he makes its virtue dependent upon baptism, teaching that it is first vitalized by that rite, and accordingly is quite a different thing after baptism from what it was before. So baptism takes precedence of faith as a condition and

¹ *Via Media*, Lecture V.

means of justification. In its nature justification appears in the Oxford scheme not simply as pardon, but as sanctification, and as such admitting of progressive increase by means of good works. In fact, the Tractarians adopted substantially the view of justification which is contained in Romish standards.

The Oxford Tracts were acceptable to only a fraction of the Church whose cause they assumed to champion. The bishops, as a body, were much displeased with them, and some of them were very open and pronounced in their disapprobation. Wilson, Bishop of Calcutta, declared of the Oxford teaching in general: "The whole system goes to generate, as I cannot but think, an inadequate, and superficial, and superstitious religion." From outsiders the verdict was naturally, to say the least, quite as emphatic. A contributor to the Edinburgh Review, while yet the discussion of the Tracts was a matter of public interest, wrote as follows on their teaching: "It tends to rob Christianity of its chief glory as a spiritual and moral institute, and to render it a system of mere formalism; to substitute for the worship founded on intelligent faith a devotion which is a species of mechanism, and rites which operate as by magic. Their doctrine of apostolical succession itself is neither more nor less respectable than that of the hereditary sanctity of the Brahmanical caste; while the prayer mills of the Tartars afford a fair illustration of their doctrine of sacramental efficacy."

The developments subsequent to the year 1841 now claim our attention. These may be described in a single sentence as a still further growth of the tendencies revealed in the Tracts. Very speedily ardent disciples

outran their masters, at least the more moderate of their masters. The British Critic, the mouthpiece from 1841 to 1843 of the most advanced Tractarianism, or Ritualism, as the general development may best be called which the Tracts initiated, declared expressly that the “unprotestantizing” of the National Church was an end of such momentous import as to be one of the few things justifying agitation. “It is absolutely necessary,” said this periodical, “towards the consistency of the system which certain parties are laboring to restore, that truths should be clearly stated which as yet have been but intimated, and others developed which are now but in germ. And as we go on, we must recede more and more from the principles, if any such there be, of the English Reformation.” Departure from the English Reformation was only another name for approach to Rome. So the British Critic understood, as is evident from such language as this: “We trust, of course, that active and visible union with the See of Rome is not of the essence of the Church; at the same time, we are deeply conscious that in lacking it, far from asserting a right, we forego a great privilege.” Besides this obeisance toward Rome in theory, there was an endeavor to copy Roman manners in practice. Catechisms and books of devotion, formed after the Roman model, were circulated; images and crucifixes were used as aids in private devotions; and auricular confession was put into the rank of a high duty and privilege. This attempt, however, to inaugurate Ritualistic practice was less successful at this date (1841–1843) than at a more recent time. Ritual, as a later member of the school explains, is properly an outgrowth from

dogma, and it was necessary, therefore, that dogma should receive a more definite and complete development before an elaborate ritual could be successfully maintained.

Among the leaders, R. H. Froude soon gave expression to a most pronounced dislike of the English Reformation and the English Reformers. His death, occurring at an early stage in the movement, leaves only conjecture as respects the goal to which his principles would have led him. W. G. Ward was equally disposed to vilify the Reformation, and was lavish in his praise of the Romish system. So far was his rage against Protestantism carried, that he could speak of the Lutheran doctrine of justification and the principle of private judgment as falling in their nature and tendency below atheism itself. Newman in 1839 began to feel a strong repugnance to saying anything against Romanism, and before the end of 1845 he found the road, which he had fancied to be a *via media*, leading straight into the midst of Rome. Ward of course betook himself to the same refuge; so also Oakeley, Dalgairns, Faber, Simpson, Northcote, and others. Somewhat of a stimulus to a still further exodus seems to have been given by the Gorham case, which brought forth the legal decision, in 1850, that failure to hold the doctrine of baptismal regeneration was no insuperable bar to promotion in the Establishment. Among those who migrated to the Romish camp within a few years of this episode were the two Wilberforces, Allies, Dodsworth, and Manning. There were some later instances of defection, but since 1864 scarcely any persons of note have exchanged Anglicanism for Romanism.

Pusey, who held the position of chief influence among those who kept the Tractarian faith, continued to maintain a polemical attitude toward certain points of Romanism, but exhibited, nevertheless, large sympathy with some of its fundamental dogmas. In one of his later works, the *Eirenicon*, he declares to Newman the identity of his view of tradition with that of the Council of Trent. "I meant to maintain," he writes, "that the Church of England does hold a divine authority in the Church, to be exercised a certain way, deriving the truth from Holy Scripture, following apostolical tradition, under the guidance of God the Holy Ghost. I fully believe there is no difference between us in this. The *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*, which our own divines have so often inculcated, contains, I believe, the selfsame doctrine as laid down in the Council of Trent upon tradition." In the same work he expresses himself as fully satisfied with the Trent doctrine of justification. He says: "There is not one statement in the elaborate chapter on justification in the Council of Trent which any of us could fail of receiving; nor is there one of their anathemas on the subject which in the least rejects any statement of the Church of England." About his only objection to the doctrine of transubstantiation is that it is too explicit, too ambitious to define the way in which the real body of Christ is present. As to the fact of the real bodily presence he makes no question, and defines it moreover as an *objective* presence, by which he evidently means to denote a "presence within the material limits of the consecrated elements."¹ As re-

¹ See the valuable work of George Trevor on the Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrifice and Participation of the Holy Eucharist, 1876.

spects the sacrificial character of the eucharist, Pusey approximates to the doctrine of the mass. "The Objectivists," says Trevor, referring to Pusey, Keble, and those of like views, "insisting on consecration and oblation more than communion, refine away the material element into a 'vessel,' a 'garment or veil,' leaving little difference from the Romish 'accidents,' and resulting in a sacrifice almost exactly the same as the mass." In his zeal for specific confession and formal absolution Pusey appears at no great remove from the Romish standard. On the other hand, as respects the position assigned by Rome to the Virgin, he assumes a decidedly hostile attitude. His so called "*Eirenicon*" is largely a polemic against the dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin, and against the excessive veneration of her encouraged by Romanists. But even here he has his affinity with Rome, being disposed to concede that the Virgin was sanctified before birth, and that she lived in continuous possession of saintship. As respects asceticism, Pusey exhibits quite distinctly a Romeward leaning. The position early announced by him that there is no absolute cleansing between baptism and the day of judgment affords a natural basis for an ascetic theory, the supposed absence of such cleansing being a motive to compensations by means of penance.

The history of the Ritualistic School, on the whole, in the three or four decades following its rise, appears as one of increasing alienation from everything distinctly Protestant. Indeed, it has learned to use the term Protestant only as a term of dire reproach, and to claim for itself the title of Catholic, or the more modest one of Anglo-Catholic. This drift of Ritualism is well illus-

trated by the following statements from Mr. Shaw : “ At first, much respect was professed for the older English divines, such as Hooker. Then it was found that the theology of the Elizabethan age, and even that of James I., was by no means in harmony with that of Ritualism. It became necessary therefore to confine the period of Anglican orthodoxy within narrow limits. Laud and the Caroline divines were supposed alone to afford the true type ; and those who took part in the revision of the Prayer Book at the Restoration were deemed, by what they then effected, to have purged the Church from the evil leaven of the early Reformers. It would appear, however, that this last refuge is now failing ; that this platform, which it was hoped was firm, though narrow, is felt to be giving away. The ‘Church Times,’ after having long given up Cranmer and Ridley, and denied them the title of martyrs, on the ground that on the testimony of their own works they appear not to have died for the truth, has now found it needful to disavow the Caroline writers. In a remarkable passage of the number for January 25th, 1868, it says : ‘The plain fact is that the modern Tractarian School accepts all that is positive in the writings of Anglo-Catholic divines of the seventeenth century, and rejects the negative part.’ In other words, it rejects, I presume, their protests against Rome, which form the principal negative part of their teaching.”¹

To show the animus of Ritualism in its later stage, we will quote from essays, lectures, and other manifestoes which have appeared since 1860. One essayist marks out the geography of Christ’s kingdom on earth

¹ *Principles at Stake, Essays on Church Questions of the Day*, edited by G. H. Sumner, 1868.

as follows: “The Catholic idea is, that union and communion with the Church is absolutely necessary for union and communion with Christ; and that persons are received into communion with the Church in order to union with Christ; and, further, that this communion is effected by a communication of a spiritual gift, an actual bestowal of the grace of God to the person through this ministration of the Church’s ordinances. . . . The Greek, the Roman, the Anglican, are all portions of the one Catholic Church, because they hold the common faith, and they retain the one priesthood, and consequently are still one body, though intercommunion is interrupted. But the Nestorian and Eutychian communities in the East, though they have and still do retain the one priesthood, yet are separated from and form no portion of the one body, because they hold not the one faith. So also, the Protestant bodies in Europe form no portion of the one body, because they have renounced the one priesthood. They established a system independent of the Church, external, and even hostile to it; consequently they have cut themselves off from the participation of the one Spirit as living in the Church and flowing through the sacraments, which are the veins and arteries of the one body.” The same writer charges Protestantism with being the source of all modern apostasy from the faith. In still further expression of his dislike of Protestant principles, he exhibits a certain vexation over the Thirty-Nine Articles. Though he thinks the effort to explain away their obnoxious sense not altogether utopian, he evidently entertains all the while an underlying sympathy with those who speak of the Articles as “those forty stripes save one laid on the

back of the Anglican priesthood.” The resemblance of the services of the Ritualists to those of the Romanists he allows, and glories in. “Anglicans,” he says, “are reproached by Protestants with their resemblance to Romans; they say a stranger, entering into a church where ritual is carefully attended to, might easily mistake it for a Roman service. Of course he might; the whole purpose of the great revival has been to eliminate the dreary Protestantism of the Hanoverian period, and to restore the glory of Catholic worship. Our churches are restored after the mediæval pattern, and our Ritual must accord with the Catholic standard. Our Book of Common Prayer is no Protestant invention.”¹

Another contributor to the same list of essays speaks of the Lutheran doctrine of justification as “the most anti-missionary and the most antichristian of dogmas.” In a different connection he expresses his belief that while an English Churchman loses by going over to Romanism, “a Dissenter who joins the Roman Church gains unspeakably.”² Referring to the iconoclasm of the Reformers, he likens them to Nebuchadnezzar, who burnt Solomon’s temple to the ground, to Belshazzar, who turned the hallowed vessels into instruments of drunken revelry, and to Antiochus Epiphanes, who set up the abomination of desolation in the holy place,—a list of precedents which surely the Reformers did not have in mind. They were thinking rather of the Moses who ground the golden calf to powder, of the Hezekiah who broke the brazen serpent in pieces, and of the

¹ Rev. E. L. Blenkinsopp, in *The Church and the World*, edited by Orby Shipley, 1867.

² R. F. Littledale, in *Lectures in Defence of Church Principles*.

Josiah who overthrew the houses of the sodomites, cut down the groves of Ashtoreth, and desolated the site of the idolatrous altar at Bethel.

The estimate which this writer places upon the foremost architect of England's State Church may be learned from the fact that he speaks of him as "the apostate Cranmer."¹ A companion essayist condemns Protestantism as being in its essence an apostasy from the only secure basis of religion, *ecclesiastical authority*. "Scripture," he says, "without an authorized interpreter, is worse than useless."² A similar protest is aimed against Protestantism in the declaration of a fellow Ritualist, that "with the supernatural, reason has no right to interfere." This being interpreted means that he who goes behind Church authority and inquires into its warrant is guilty of a wicked presumption. Against both Protestant and Rationalist, he says, "is ranged a compact united body,—the Catholic army, maintaining the supremacy in matters of religion, external as well as internal, of authority over intellect, of faith beyond reason."³ On this basis any species of religious fellowship with Protestant Dissenters would seem to be very much out of character. Nor have Ritualists neglected to brand the criminality of such a procedure. In a book composed for the instruction and admonition of the Anglican bishops, great horror is expressed over the Queen's participation in a eucharistic service of the Scottish Church, and over the neglect of the prelates to warn her against this error. "The Queen," says the writer,

¹ The Church and the World, edited by Orby Shipley, vol. iii., 1868.

² Essay by S. Baring-Gould.

³ Essay by E. G. Wood.

“has been led, through this sad, nay fearful, neglect on the part of the bishops, to commit a still higher degree of sin, by sitting down with the Presbyterians in the kirk of Crathie at their imitation of the blessed sacrament of the Lord’s body and blood. This act, in effect, cuts her Majesty off from communion with the Church of England. And her reception of the blessed sacrament in that Church, with the burden of unrepented sin upon her, will bring guilt upon her soul and upon the soul of him who administers it unto her.”¹

The predilection of the Ritualists for a sentimental and materialized devotion, as also the tendency of some of them to a species of Pharisaic self-appreciation, is strikingly exemplified in the anonymous essay of a writer who styles his composition an autobiography. He maintains that meeting Christ at the altar excels beyond all comparison meeting him in prayer; that the real presence in the eucharist is the centre of Christian worship; that the Redeemer is made perpetually to tabernacle upon earth by the perpetual offering (in one place or another) of the eucharistic sacrifice; that all possible superiority to Rome in freedom from abuses can never make up for the loss of the perpetual presence, “or for the practical change which has turned our clergy from a sacrificing priesthood into a preaching ministry.” He says still further, that confession has come to be looked upon as necessary for all who are earnestly pressing toward the mark, that monasteries will soon become as common among Anglo-Catholics as sisterhoods now are, and that with an increase of mortifications answers to prayers may be expected to assume a

¹ Lendrum, *The Principles of the Reformation*, 1875.

more directly supernatural character. The undoubting confidence with which the autobiographer writes is striking, and at no point more so than where he presumes upon the gift of discerning spirits. "A high standard of holiness," he says, "can now only be found among Catholics, with perhaps a few exceptions belonging to a generation fast dying out." In this power, however, of discerning spirits, he does not appear to be singular; for Dr. Pusey has informed us that those whose ecclesiastical relations and beliefs deprive them of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist are less closely united to Him than those who are inside the Catholic faith and fellowship; that "they who have observed pious Presbyterians and pious English Catholics have discerned among our people a spiritual life, of a kind which is not among theirs,—in a word, a sacramental life."¹

Other quotations might be made from various writings showing how Ritualists have advocated prayers for the dead, either general or specific; a doctrine of purgatory, which, if not Romish, naturally gravitates toward the Romish type; worship of saints; and adoration of the real presence in the eucharist.

The efforts of the Ritualists to carry their principles into practice have met with very considerable rebuffs. According to a manifesto of the year 1875, they claim license for the following items of ceremonial: (1) the eastward position; (2) certain vestments in ancient use; (3) lights; (4) the mixed chalice; (5) unleavened bread in the sacrament; (6) incense. As respects these points, the legal decisions rendered have been in the main

¹ *Eirenicon.*

adverse. Most of the judges seem to have shared the view of Disraeli, who described Ritualism as the "mass in masquerade." A recent decision (1892), however, has conceded the lawfulness of several of the practices in the above list. The Ritualistic party appears now to be left substantially free to run its course. It claims the adherence of a large fraction of the clergy.

What has been said may need to be qualified in a measure by the consideration that Ritualism is a thing of degrees. Some who are counted as adherents are not quite so damnable in their attitude toward those dwelling in the outer darkness of Protestant Dissent, or quite so thoroughgoing in their assertion of ceremonial magic, as are the exponents who have been cited in the preceding account. Concerning the general body of Ritualists also, it is to be allowed that they have exhibited a praiseworthy zeal in religious enterprise, and have set a good example in the direction of ministering to the poor. It may be, too, that permanent good will result from the attention which they have drawn to the æsthetic element in worship. Nevertheless, in its general cast Ritualism is fairly described as representing a lapse from rational Christianity. It was born in illusion, and has been nurtured by illusion. Its leaders, with all their endeavor to found their structure upon Christian antiquity, were not possessed of a genuine historic spirit. They reproduced only a part of the reality. They overlooked the fact, that patristic opinion was in no small degree a matter of circumstances, accretion, and change; that the fathers, being thrown into the midst of untried conditions, were imperfectly protected against their environment; that they allowed themselves to be influenced to

some extent, not only by Gentile philosophy, but also ere long by the common paganism which surrounded the Church, and flowed into its borders through the untrained minds and hearts of great numbers of converts; that consequently to give over to Christian antiquity a deciding voice is to make an uncertain, shifting, mixed system the standard. It is only the luminous mist spread by the religious fancy over the early centuries which gives credibility to the Tractarian thesis on patristic authority. The fathers of the fourth century were as far removed in time from the apostles as were Newman and Pusey, Ward and Froude, from the martyrs of the English Reformation. The intervening period in the former case afforded really far fewer safeguards against a drift in doctrine and ceremony than were at hand in the latter. To suppose therefore the Church of the fourth century to present a pure image of New Testament principles and teachings is to indulge in a gratuitous and improbable assumption. It gave only a partial and mixed reproduction of those principles and teachings, as did also the third century, and even the second century. Good work was indeed done, and there was an approximate agreement on various subjects; but had the consensus of patristic opinions been much broader and steadier than it was, it would still be unreasonable to make it strictly authoritative.

The Vatican Council doubtless exerted a wholesome influence upon the Ritualists, as checking their Rome-ward tendency. At the same time it increased the theoretical difficulties of their position. For, manifestly, the dogma of papal supremacy and infallibility is fundamental to the conception of Christianity as an existing

institution. It defines the whole subject of ecclesiastical authority, and is determinative of the function of revelation itself. If therefore the dogma is true, the Ritualists are no true Catholics, but only schismatics, dissenters, rebels, and heretics. If, on the other hand, the dogma is false, if the Pope is not God's infallible vicar, then he is a pretender, scarcely second either to Mohammed or to any other in the extent of his false claims ; and to acknowledge the communion which is built on these claims as a part of the true Church, while Protestants are cast wholly out of the pale, is eminently ridiculous. Moreover, the Ritualistic maxim respecting the infallibility of the Church (as distinguished from the Pope) is on the same supposition discredited. If so vast a section of the Church as is the Romish, comprising a majority of all who boast the name of Catholic, can adopt fundamental error, it would seem that the Church is not above the liability of dogmatic mistakes. To be sure, there is a chance to say that the Church as a whole, and not any part, however large, is infallible. But such a view can satisfy only an artificial mind, since the addition of a minority of erring men to a majority has no tendency to create infallibility. And besides, it is to be observed that a dogma like that of papal infallibility raises a barrier against church unity which promises to be everlasting. The infallibility of the Church, therefore, besides having been in abeyance wellnigh a thousand years, is likely to remain practically abortive for long ages to come, if it is conditioned on church unity. Can it be the order of Divine Providence that men must rest upon this sunken faculty, this inoperative prerogative ? The supposition is too near the border

of absurdity to need serious discussion. The manifest order of Providence is that every man, according to his opportunity, should energetically apply his reason, his common sense, and his power of spiritual perception to the God-given data in revelation and history.

Among those whom the Tractarian wave carried beyond the borders of the Anglican Establishment, Newman has commanded most interest and regard. Manning has indeed made a notable record. His energy, executive gift, and audacity were very serviceable in giving to Ultramontanism that brazen front which enabled it to persist, in the face of scathing criticism, to the coveted declaration of papal absolutism and infallibility. Still, he has won no exceptional distinction outside the inferior rôle of a party manager. Newman, on the other hand, has made a reputation for genius, and earned hearty respect as a man of eminent religious sensibility and devotion. The fact that he has secured so largely the appreciation of Protestants is a unique testimonial in his favor. The Romish Church may fitly be grateful to the Oxford movement for bearing to her bosom so great a prize. Nevertheless, if we look narrowly at Newman's contribution to that Church, we shall find that it is subject to some discount. The prestige which his talents have given to the Roman Catholic cause in England has, of course, been highly valued by all intelligent Romanists. It must be allowed also that in various connections he has expressed himself as a Romanist of the purest water on the great point of subjecting private judgment to church authority. Nothing, for example, could be more perfectly orthodox than this

commendation of mental passivity within the pale of holy Church : “ We cannot without absurdity call ourselves at once believers and inquirers also. Thus it is sometimes spoken of as a hardship that a Catholic is not allowed to inquire into the truth of his creed : of course he cannot if he would retain the name of believer. He cannot be both inside and outside the Church at once. It is merely common sense to tell him, that if he is seeking, he has not found.”¹ Similar prescriptions for gluing down the eyelids in the presence of the teachings of the Church might be cited. Rome could not ask for better precepts in this line than Newman has given. But, on the other hand, he has more than once expressed himself in a way that must have seemed questionable to his brethren. The general theory expounded in his “ *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* ” is in painful contrast with the language of ecumenical councils and papal documents ; for while the former describes some of the cardinal doctrines of Romanism as gradually issuing out of mist and obscurity, the stereotyped representation of the latter is that these things

¹ *Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*, p. 181. Of this work John Tulloch remarks : “ I have carefully examined it, and found it at the root — as I think all who probe it critically must find it — to be little more than a process of make-belief. Only assent strongly enough to anything, and it will embed itself in your mental constitution as a verity of the first order. But the further question always arises, What is the value of a principle of certitude which is at bottom planted neither in reason nor in evidence, but in the mere force of the grip which you yourself take of the thing believed ? Faith is good ; but a faith that is neither enlightened nor determined by facts in the shape of evidence, but simply by the blind assent with which the mind sets itself upon its object, may be as much a basis of superstition as of religion.” (*Movements of Religious Thought in Britain in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 103.)

have been held and taught in the Church from the beginning. How it must grieve the sight of the average apologist to observe such a sentence as this! “Christianity developed in the form, first, of a Catholic, then of a Papal Church.” We suspect also that the average champion of the Romish faith would prefer to omit the following passage, as giving but a doubtful advantage to his side: “The Jews could sin in a way no other contemporary race could sin, for theirs was a sin against light; and Catholics can sin with a depth and intensity with which Protestants cannot sin. There will be more blasphemy, more hatred of God, more diabolical rebellion, more of awful sacrilege, more of vile hypocrisy, in a Catholic country than anywhere else, because there is in it more of sin against light.”¹ As has been intimated elsewhere, some portions of Newman’s Letter to the Duke of Norfolk in answer to Gladstone read almost like a satire on the doctrine of papal infallibility, though no one assumes that they were written with such an intent. That the promulgation of the doctrine was an affliction to him, we know from this strong declaration in a letter to Bishop Ullathorne, while the Vatican Council was in session: “As to myself personally, please God, I do not expect any trial at all; but I cannot help suffering with the many souls who are suffering, and I look with anxiety at the prospect of having to defend decisions which may not be difficult to my own private judgment, but may be most difficult to maintain logically in the face of historical facts. What have we done to be treated as the faithful never were treated before? When has a definition *de fide* been a luxury of devotion, and not

¹ *Apologia*, Appendix, p. 60.

a stern painful necessity? Why should an aggressive insolent faction be allowed ‘to make the heart of the just sad whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful’? Why cannot we be let alone, when we have pursued peace and thought no evil?’”

The primary standpoint of the Ritualists would lead us to expect that the more recent tendencies in the field of Biblical criticism would obtain among them scant appreciation, as being logically opposed to a predominant stress on external authority. In fact, however, some of the prominent representatives of the party in the last few years have expressed themselves as rather friendly than otherwise to the work of criticism, and to some of its main results. Such statements as the following from Charles Gore would not seem out of place from the pen of the average representative of the Broad Church:—

“The Church has in Holy Scripture the highest expression of the mind of Christ. The familiarity of all its members with this flawless and catholic image is to ward off in each generation that tendency to deteriorate and to become materialized which belongs to all ‘traditions.’ The individual illumination is thus to react as a purifying force upon the common mind of the Christian society. The individual Christian is to pay the debt of his education, by himself ‘testing all things, and holding fast that which is good.’ . . . In the past, Christian apologists have made a great mistake in allowing opponents to advance, as objections against the historical character of the Gospel narrative, what are really objections not against its historical character,—not such as could tell against the substantially historical character

of secular documents,— but against a certain view of the meaning of inspiration. . . . The revelation of God was made in a historical process. Its record is in large part the record of a national life; it is historical. Now the inspiration of the recorder lies primarily in this, that he sees the hand of God in the history, and interprets His purpose. Further, we must add, his sense of the working of God in history increases his realization of the importance of historical fact. . . . We are, we believe, not wrong in anticipating that the Church will continue to believe and to teach that the Old Testament from Abraham downwards is really historical, and that there will be nothing to make such belief and teaching unreasonable or wilful. But within the limits of what is substantially historical there is still room for an admixture of what, though marked by spiritual purpose, is yet not strictly historical; for instance, for a feature which characterizes all early history, the attribution to first founders of what is really the remoter result of their institutions. Now historical criticism assures us that this process has been largely at work in the Pentateuch. By an analysis, for instance, the force of which is very great, it distinguishes distinct stages in the growth of the law of worship; at least an early stage, such as is represented in the ‘Book of the Covenant,’ a second stage in the Book of Deuteronomy, a last stage in the ‘Priestly Code.’ What we may suppose to have happened is that Moses himself established a certain germ of ceremonial enactment in connection with the ark and its sacred tent, and with the ‘ten words’; and that this developed always as ‘the law of Moses,’ the whole result being constantly attributed, probably unconsciously and

certainly not from any intention to deceive, to the original founder. . . . It may fairly be represented, on a review of our Lord's teaching as a whole, that, if He had intended to convey instruction to us on critical and literary questions, He would have made His purpose plainer. His utterances about the Old Testament do not seem to be nearly definite or clear enough to allow of our supposing that in this case He is departing from the general method of the Incarnation, by bringing to bear the unveiled omniscience of the Godhead to anticipate or foreclose a development of natural knowledge.”¹

If the author of these citations can be regarded as representing even a fraction of his party, his words are a significant index of what is transpiring in the English-speaking world,—a token that the drift is away from the technical standpoint, and toward the freer and broader view of Biblical inspiration and authority.

III.—THE BROAD CHURCH.

It is impossible to make any very definite statement of the distinctive beliefs of the Broad Church as a party. The spirit of the party is antagonistic to exact formulas, and, while it has had leaders of greater or less prominence, no one has held the place of an accredited oracle. It may be said, however, in general, that the Broad Church school repudiates decidedly the sacerdotal basis of the High Church system; that it abridges somewhat the distinction between the ecclesiastical and the secu-

¹ The Holy Spirit and Inspiration, in *Lux Mundi*, a Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation, edited by Charles Gore, 1890.

lar; that it tends to exalt the authority of reason at the expense of traditional standards; that it views dogmatic diversity with a large measure of equanimity, and is tolerant of revised opinions as evolved by Biblical criticism. Some of its representatives are unmistakably rationalistic in their premises and mental habit; but rationalism, in any extreme sense, cannot be alleged of the party as a whole. Its animus in the present is indicated by the following rather curious description from the pen of a Broad Church writer: "Firstly, the Broad Church are those who love the High Church, because they perceive that High Churchism bears witness to the sacramental character of forms and ceremonies. We need such outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual graces. The Broad Church are those who love the Low Church, because they perceive that Low Churchism bears witness to spiritual freedom. The soul must have this too, it will not be bound by that it uses; we need forms and ceremonies; we need spiritual freedom. The High Church would cast out the Low Church, and the Low Church the High, and both would cast out the Broad; but the Broad desires to retain both,—it is *comprehensive*. Secondly, the Broad Church feels the need of bringing the praying and the preaching of the Anglican Church into harmony with nineteenth-century thought and feeling. It does not believe that the theology of Constantine in the fourth century was any more final than the settlement of Henry VIII. in the sixteenth century. It desires to bring doctrine to the test of living thought, restating its substance in terms of present knowledge,—it is *radical*. Thirdly, it uses dogmatic theology as a basis of action, and the formu-

laries of the national Church as a mechanism of ritual,—it is *conservative*. The three descriptive adjectives of the Broad Church are these: *comprehensive, radical, conservative*.¹ The relative tolerance, it should be added, which the writer expresses for the Anglican formularies, does not extend to the so-called Athanasian Creed. With very pardonable incisiveness he remarks of the damnatory clause in this creed: “To say that every one who does not keep whole and undefiled the letter of such a faith shall be damned forever is simply to qualify one’s self for a lunatic asylum.”

Among those who initiated the Broad Church movement, namely, Coleridge, Thirlwall, Hampden, Whately, and Thomas Arnold, the last might be described as an advocate not merely of the broad, but of the broadest view of the Church. The ideal according to his teaching requires Church and State to be coextensive and identical. He acknowledged that there were great obstacles in the way, but thought they were not so formidable as to preclude at least a very close approximation to the ideal. As his scheme logically dictated, he was averse to precise and exacting standards, as calculated to produce dissent, and narrowed very much the distinction between clergy and laity, discarding the view that the former are indispensable mediums of grace, and maintaining that laymen ought to be empowered to administer the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist in the absence of a clergyman. Says Dean Stanley: “It was as frustrating the union of all Christians, in accomplishing what he believed to be the true end enjoined by their common Master, that he felt so strongly

¹ H. R. Haweis, *The Broad Church, or What is Coming*, p. 27.

against the desire for uniformity of opinion or worship, which he used to denounce under the name of sectarianism ; it was as annihilating what he believed to be the apostolical idea of the Church, that he felt so strongly against that principle of separation between the clergy and laity which he used to denounce under the name of priestcraft.”¹ In 1833 Dr. Arnold gave a public expression to his views in a pamphlet on the Principles of Church Reform, advocating, among other things, the comprehending of Dissenters within the pale of the Establishment on such terms that the principles of neither party should be compromised. The pamphlet naturally called forth a vehement opposition.

While the views of Thomas Arnold represent the extreme of comprehension, the representatives of the Broad Church party have declared generally for an ecclesiastical theory that is more or less akin to his. They have rejected with unanimity the dogma of a necessary apostolical succession as an arrogant and flimsy conceit. Archbishop Whately argued with great vigor against resting the claim to ecclesiastical legitimacy upon the narrow and chimerical foundation of a continuous episcopal succession. “One may not unfrequently hear,” he says, “members of Episcopalian churches pronouncing severe condemnation on those of other communions, and even excluding them from the Christian body, on the ground, not of their not being under the *best* form of ecclesiastical government, but of their wanting the very essentials of a Christian Church ; namely, the very same distinct orders of the hierarchy that the apostles appointed : and this, while the Episcopalian have them-

¹ Life and Letters of Thomas Arnold.

selves universally so far varied from the apostolical institution as to have in one Church several bishops; each of whom consequently differs in the office he holds, as to a most important point, from one of the primitive bishops, as much as the governor of any one of our colonies does from a sovereign prince.”¹ In place of finding the validity of a Church in conformity to an apostolic precedent, which, if it existed, cannot be proved to be universally binding, he finds it in the fact that its institutions “are not in themselves superstitious or ungodly, not at variance with gospel principles, or with any divine injunction that was designed to be of universal obligation.” He declares, moreover, that “there is not a minister in all Christendom who is able to trace up with any approach to certainty his own spiritual pedigree,” and who can therefore be assured, on the High Church theory, of his proper qualification to administer a single sacrament. Frederic Myers, a writer whose ability seems to have greatly exceeded his fame, challenges apostolical succession in a kindred manner. “If we should know,” he says, “without dispute, the names of all the persons who have filled any particular see from the apostles’ times to our own, and the names of the persons by whom they were consecrated, this would go but a little way to the proof that any apostolic gift had been duly transmitted through the medium of this succession. For that some scheme of means is essential to the conferring of such a gift by one man to another will be admitted. Then what the essential means are must first be indisputably determined; and then whether these means have been in each case strictly

¹ *The Kingdom of Christ.*

observed. The only proof which could be received as satisfactory in a case where such tremendous results depend upon the alternative must be one which shall afford a reasonable probability that in every one of the distinct terms of the series of ordinations between the apostles' times and our own, this scheme of means has been observed uniformly in all essential particulars. Now the evidence which is necessary to the establishing of this is of too complex and subtle a character to be conveyed through the ordinary channels of human testimony. Never in any religion in the world was there heard of anything so difficult as this theory of the transmission of an invisible latent gift of grace for nearly two thousand years being essential to the validity of priestly acts.”¹ Archdeacon Hare is no more friendly to the theory in question. He finds in the Scriptures no warrant for predicating the necessity of episcopacy. “Feeble and flimsy,” he writes, “as are the Scriptural arguments on which the Romanists maintain the inalienable primacy of St. Peter, they are far more specious and plausible than those derived from the same source, on the strength of which it has been attempted to establish the absolute necessity of episcopacy to the existence of a Christian Church.”² Dean Stanley very decisively impeaches the notion of the positive prescription and the sole right of episcopacy. “It is certain,” he writes, “that throughout the first century, and for the first years of the second, that is, through the latest chapters of the Acts, the Apostolical Epistles, and the writings of

¹ Catholic Thoughts on the Church of Christ and the Church of England, pp. 102, 103.

² Quoted by James Rigg, Modern Anglican Theology.

Clement and Hermas, bishop and presbyter were convertible terms, and that the body of men so called were the rulers — so far as any permanent rulers existed — of the early Church. It is certain that, as the necessities of the time demanded, first at Jerusalem, then in Asia Minor, the elevation of one presbyter above the rest by the almost universal law which even in republics engenders a monarchical element, the word bishop gradually changed its meaning, and by the middle of the second century became restricted to the chief presbyter of the locality. It is certain that in no instance before the beginning of the third century is the title or function of the Pagan or Jewish priesthood applied to the Christian pastors.”¹ Professor Jowett subscribes to the conclusion that historical evidence for episcopacy, in the High Church sense, is fundamentally lacking. This is sufficiently indicated in his estimate of the testimony of the fathers of the third century, of whom he says: “We cannot err in supposing that those who could add nothing to what is recorded in the New Testament of the life of Christ and His apostles, had no real knowledge of lesser matters, as, for example, the origin of episcopacy.”²

Among those who have more recently handled the question of “comprehension,” H. B. Wilson, author of one of the articles in the famous volume of “Essays and Reviews,”³ has taken a radical view. He argues that, in

¹ Christian Institutions.

² The Epistles of Saint Paul.

³ The volume of Essays and Reviews was published in 1861. It called forth an attempt at prosecution, which failed in the court of final appeal. The contributors to the volume were Frederick Temple, Rowland Williams, Baden Powell, H. B. Wilson, C. W. Goodwin, Mark Pattison, and Benjamin Jowett. As most of the essays were rather directed against traditional

order to give the Establishment a truly national character, "the freedom of opinion which belongs to the English citizen should be conceded to the English Churchman"; and that "the freedom of opinion which is already practically enjoyed by the members of the congregation cannot without injustice be denied to its ministers." The State ought, he says, "without aiming at an universal comprehension, which would be utopian, to suffer the perpetuation of no unnecessary barriers, excluding from the communion or the ministry of the national Church." The language of Matthew Arnold implies, to say the least, no greater love for ecclesiastical fences. "The Church of our country," he writes, "is to be considered as a national Christian society for the promotion of goodness. To a right-judging mind the cardinal points of belief for either the member or the minister of such a society are but two, *Salvation by Righteousness* and *Righteousness by Jesus Christ.*"¹ The following from Professor Jowett bears somewhat in the same direction: "If in the age of the apostles it seemed to be the duty of believers to separate themselves from the world and take up a hostile position, not less marked in the present age is the duty of abolishing in a Christian country what has now become an artificial distinction, and seeking by every means in our power, by fairness, by truthfulness, by knowledge, by

views than constructive in their tendency, they formed together a rather heavy dose of negations, at least for the simple believer. Some statements in the book might have been better guarded and qualified than they were. Still it must be said that a good part of the volume was no discredit to the authors, and that the wide-spread disturbance which ensued in the ranks of the clergy betokened in their midst an abnormal amount of timid and technical supernaturalism.

¹ Last Essays on Church and Religion.

love unfeigned, by the absence of party and prejudice, by acknowledging the good in all things, to reconcile the Church to the world, the one half of our nature to the other ; drawing the mind off from speculative difficulties, or matters of party and opinion, to that which almost all equally acknowledge, and almost equally rest short of, — the life of Christ.”¹

As respects the theological opinions of Broad Churchmen, we confine ourselves to very brief specifications of noteworthy points. Coleridge, after passing from a deistical type of Unitarianism into sympathy with a pantheistical philosophy, finally embraced the theistic and the trinitarian faith. Among the peculiarities of his doctrinal views were a distinction between the understanding and the reason used in the interest of the subjective verification of religious truth, the theory that the Bible is authoritative in its general tenor rather than infallible in subordinate particulars, a Kantian view of original sin as something generated by each will instead of being inherited, and the assignment of redemptive efficacy to the incarnation and manifestation of the divine in Christ rather than to an expiation alleged to have been accomplished through His death.

Something of the vein of Coleridge may be seen in F. D. Maurice, who, if not always a clear writer, has undoubtedly been an influential one. The extent to which he has impressed himself upon a wide circle of readers may be attributed in part to the leaven which his deep religious character imported into his productions. Rarely has one earned a nobler epitaph than is contained in this description of Maurice by his son :

¹ Epistles of Saint Paul.

“The characteristic of the man which left the deepest impression on me was a striking union of severe earnestness of purpose with irresistible kindness. These two qualities were at once the cause and the effect of the complete drenching of his whole being in Christianity.” Charles Kingsley, who was not a little indebted to Maurice in his theological views, says of him: “The most beautiful human soul whom God has ever in his great mercy allowed me, most unworthy, to meet with upon this earth; the man who, of all men whom I have seen, approached nearest to my conception of Saint John, the apostle of love.”¹

As respects Biblical inspiration, the view of Maurice was much like that of Coleridge. In the field of christology the early patristic teaching that Christ, as the Logos, is in all men the principle of the higher reason and life, was evidently a favorite one with him. “Christ,” he says, “is in every man the source of all light that ever visits him, the root of all the righteous thoughts and acts that he is ever able to conceive or do. . . . Apart from Him, I feel that there dwells in me no good thing; but I am sure that I am not apart from Him, nor are you, nor is any man.”² His explanation of the atonement leans toward the moral and the mystical theories, and repudiates the idea of expiation or satisfaction. “I must give up,” he says, “Archbishop Magee, for I am determined to keep that which makes the atonement precious to my heart and conscience.” On the subject of justification, he indulges the statement that Christ’s justification, which was demonstrated when

¹ Quoted in *Life of F. D. Maurice* by Frederick Maurice, ii. 554.

² *Theological Essays*.

the Father raised Him from the dead, is the justification of each and every man, so that all that is necessary in this relation would seem to be that men should recognize and feel an already existing fact. "Saint Paul," he writes, "takes it for granted that this justification of the Son of God and the Son of Man was his own justification,—his own, not because he was Saul of Tarsus, not because he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, but because he was a man. . . . If He had justified His Son by raising Him from the dead,—if in that act He had justified the race for which Christ had died,—then it was lawful to tell men that they were justified before God, that they were sons of God in the only begotten Son." In connection with the subject of future punishment he intimates his belief that the word eternal has nothing to do with time or duration, and verges very closely upon the theory of universal restoration. "I ask no one," he says, "to pronounce, for I dare not pronounce myself, what are the possibilities of resistance in a human will to the loving will of God. There are times when they seem to me — thinking of myself more than others — almost infinite. But I know that there is something which must be infinite. I am obliged to believe in an abyss of love which is deeper than the abyss of death: I dare not lose faith in that love." It may be added, that Maurice had no sympathy with the theory which condemns us to worship an unknown God. Dean Mansel's attempt to found faith upon a "sceptical agnosticism" he utterly disapproved, believing that the subtle Dean provided a way of escape from Hegel only by opening a path which leads to Hume.

Were we not dealing here with special theological

views, the combination of catholicity of feeling with high literary talent, exemplified in H. H. Milman and A. P. Stanley, would invite us to assign to them no less space than to any Broad Churchman. The same may also be said of that prince of the modern pulpit, F. W. Robertson. Each of these names, whatever reproach it may have borne in the camp of the Ritualists, is an honor to the English Church and to English letters.

Matthew Arnold represents the extreme of dogmatic eccentricity within the Broad Church party. His postulates are really more sweeping than those of Colenso, whose free dealing with the Old Testament roused such a storm of reprobation in 1863 and the years following; though naturally the writings of the layman have not been such a source of scandal as those of the bishop.¹ Matthew Arnold treats the doctrine of the personality of God as an unwarranted and mischievous assumption, complains that the advocates of this doctrine put a magnified and non-natural man in the place of the Divine Being, and offers as his own definition of God the fan-

¹ Colenso claimed to entertain no prejudice against miracles as such. His impeachment of the historical character of the Old Testament narratives rested upon alleged discrepancies, incongruities, and impossibilities. The following is a summary of his peculiar views, as baldly stated by his biographer, G. W. Cox: “(1) That only a very small portion, if any, of the Pentateuch, can have been composed or written by Moses or in the Mosaic age. (2) That Moses may have been the real guide of the Israelites to the borders of Canaan, or a person as shadowy as *Aeneas* or King Arthur. (3) That Joshua seems to be an entirely mythical character. (4) That there are two or more different and self-disproving accounts of the creation, deluge, and other events or incidents in the Book of Genesis. (5) That the priestly legislation of the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers belongs to the time of, or to a period subsequent to, the captivity of Babylon. (6) That the Book of Deuteronomy was composed in the reign of Manasseh,

tastic phrase, “*The Eternal, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness.*”¹ Miracles he disallows altogether, not excepting the resurrection of Christ. In the Bible accounts of miracles, as he maintains, we move in a world, “not of solid history, but of illusion, rumor, and fairy tale,” and he does not hesitate to speak of the four Gospels as “that wonderful mixture of truth and fiction.” The ground of this denial is not any alleged impossibility of miracles; for he has no faith in any attempt to prove their impossibility. He denies them rather on the twofold ground that they are fast being discredited by the *Zeitgeist*, or the spirit of the age, and are made to appear incredible by a comparative study of all miracles, those of the Bible not being sufficiently distinguished from others which claim the assent of no intelligent Christian.

But, on the other hand, Matthew Arnold appears as an admirer of Christianity and the Bible. He speaks of Professor Clifford’s rabid denunciations of Christianity as being “merely the crackling fireworks of youthful paradox,” and replies to the charge that the Christian religion destroyed Roman civilization with the assertion that “it was worth while to have that civilization ruined fifty times over, for the sake of planting Christianity through Europe.” Respecting the substitute for the religion of the Bible, offered by the author of “Supernatural Religion,” he remarks: “‘Here enters the true and noble faith which is the child of reason.’ Alas! for

or in that of Josiah. (7) That the Books, so called, of the Chronicles were written at a time later by some centuries than the Babylonish exile. (8) That the history of these Books of Chronicles is not, as it professes or is supposed to be, a trustworthy narrative, but a fictitious story, put together for a special purpose.”

¹ Literature and Dogma; also, God and the Bible.

our part, we should say rather, ‘Here enter the poor old dead horses of so called natural theology, with their galvanic movements.’” He says that “the indispensableness of the Bible and Christianity cannot be exaggerated,” calls Christianity “the greatest and happiest stroke ever yet made for human perfection,” and asserts that it will never become obsolete, for “whatever progress may be made in science, art, and literary culture, Christianity will still be there as what they rest against and imply, as the indispensable background of three fourths of life.” He observes still further: “The Old Testament is really a majestic homage to the grandeur of righteousness, or conduct, and a sublime witness to its necessity; while the New Testament, again, is really an incomparable elucidation by Jesus Christ of what righteousness in fact and in truth is. . . . As long as the world lasts, all who want to make progress in righteousness will come to Israel for inspiration. . . . As well imagine a man with a sense for sculpture not cultivating it by the help of the remains of Greek art, as a man with a sense for conduct not cultivating it by the help of the Bible. . . . Take a course of the Bible first, and then a course of Benjamin Franklin, Horace Greeley, Jeremy Bentham, and Mr. Herbert Spencer; see which has most effect, which satisfies you most, which gives you most power. Why, the Bible has such power for teaching righteousness, that even to those who come to it with all sorts of false notions about the God of the Bible it teaches righteousness, and fills them with the love of it.”

The tribute which Matthew Arnold pays to Christ is without qualification. Defects, or supposed defects, in

the New Testament narratives are charged in no case upon Christ, but always upon His imperfect interpreters. He sees in Him an unblemished embodiment of God's moral order, and a source of moral influence with which naught else will bear comparison. "That the Christ of the Bible," he says, "follows the universal moral order of the will of God, without being let or hindered as we are by the motions of private passion and self-will, this is evident to whoever can read the Bible with open eyes. . . . Socrates inspired boundless friendship and esteem ; but the inspiration of reason and conscience is the one inspiration which comes from him, and which impels us to live righteously as he did. A penetrating enthusiasm of love, sympathy, pity, adoration, reinforcing the inspiration of reason and duty, does not belong to Socrates. With Jesus it is different. On this point it is needless to argue ; history has proved. In the midst of errors the most prosaic, the most universal, the most unscriptural, concerning God, Christ, and righteousness, the immense emotion of love and sympathy inspired by the person and character of Jesus has had to work almost by itself alone for righteousness, and it has worked wonders." Surely Matthew Arnold, notwithstanding his radical and multiplied denials of miracles, was not altogether a disbeliever in miracles. The appearance among men of such a being as the Christ whom he portrays is in no wise explained by him. He leaves it with all the marks of a stupendous miracle. Had he duly pondered the very intimate and unique connection which the gospel miracles hold to this miraculous personality, he might perhaps have seen that to accept requires less credulity than to reject them.

IV.—SOME FACTS RESPECTING ENGLISH DISSENTERS.

In the controversy over the administration of the sacraments which followed the death of Wesley, one of the most active agitators was Alexander Kilham. He took the popular side of the question, and mingled with his advocacy of democratic principles in church affairs some severe reflections on his brethren in the ministry. At the conference of 1796, he was deposed. Soon after, he began the formation of the Methodist New Connection. A distinctive feature in the polity of the seceding body was the share in governing functions accorded to the laity. Between 1807 and 1810 a second schism occurred, the advocates of camp-meetings, which at that time were discountenanced by the general body, forming a separate denomination styled Primitive Methodists. The growth of this body, to which the "Bible Christians" are closely allied in character, was destined to be larger than that of any other of the separating parties. Another schism occurred in 1835–36, the occasion of which, apart from personal factors, consisted in differing views respecting the project of a theological school which had recently been inaugurated. The seceders were called the Wesleyan Association. Ultimately they united with a part of those who left the main body after the Conference of 1850, and so helped to constitute the Methodist Free Church. The serious defection which occurred at this time taught the Conference the need of a more liberal polity. Some steps were taken in 1852 and in 1861 towards enlarging the share of the laity in church administration, and in 1878 it was provided that

lay representatives should sit with the ministers for the discharge of certain departments of the work of the Conference. The “legal hundred” confirms the action of the mixed body, as also of the purely ministerial; but its consent is understood to be only for the sake of giving formal legality to action that is practically final.

For twenty years after the death of Wesley a prominent place among English Methodists was held by Thomas Coke. From the time that he cast in his lot with Wesley, in 1777, he was one of the most untiring and devoted servants of Methodism. Animated with the same restless temper and zest for change of scene which appeared in Whitefield, he was ever on the wing. He crossed the Atlantic eighteen times. More than any other he was the founder and superintendent of early Methodist missions. Though the General Wesleyan Missionary Society was not fully constituted till 1818, the Wesleyans had been engaged in genuine missionary work for more than a quarter of a century prior to that date, and in that work Coke was the leading spirit. His last labor was a striking tribute to his zeal in this line of Christian enterprise. He died in 1814, on his way to plant a mission in India. Coke, no doubt, had his infirmities, among which an undue willingness to be a bishop in the Anglican succession has perhaps elicited most comment. Still, his record is one that provokes esteem. His expenditure of his ample fortune and of all the energies of his manhood in the interests of Christian benevolence and enterprise entitles him to be ranked among men of singular devotion.

Among the survivors of Coke an eminent place was maintained by Joseph Benson, Adam Clarke, Richard

Watson, Jabez Bunting, and Robert Newton. Both in the ordinary labors of the ministry and in the literary field Benson acquitted himself with much credit. Clarke, by virtue of extraordinary industry, was able, notwithstanding the pressure of his ministerial labors, to place himself in the front rank of the Biblical and Oriental scholars of England in his day. Watson was entered on the roll of the Conference in 1796, when but sixteen years of age. His ability in the pulpit, his merits as a theological writer, and his services to the cause of missions, will long secure to his name a place of special honor. In intellectual strength and in symmetry of character he stands at an enviable height among Methodist worthies. Bunting was for a long time a master spirit in the legislation and the administration of the Wesleyan Connection. The finished, eloquent, and thoughtful discourses of Newton commanded for him great popularity as a preacher.

Among the later representatives of the English Wesleyans, William Arthur, James Rigg, W. B. Pope, and Luke Tyerman are well known in the Methodist world through the medium of their writings.

According to the report made at the Ecumenical Conference in Washington, the Wesleyan Methodist Church in England contained 486,950 members in 1891. If to this number are added the adherents of the Irish Conference and Wesleyan Methodists in the mission field, Australia, and France, the total is raised to 700,810. The other Methodist churches of Britain were reported at the same time as having an aggregate membership of 346,253, of whom 192,652 were credited to the Primitive Methodists.

A general bond of connection between the Baptists in Great Britain and Ireland is found in the "Baptist Union," which dates, in its original form, from 1813. That this bond is not close enough to qualify the essential character of the congregational polity may be judged from the following authoritative statement of principles: "In this Union it is fully recognized that every separate church has liberty to interpret and administer the laws of Christ, and that the immersion of believers is the only Christian baptism." According to a declaration of 1888, the following points of belief are commonly held by the churches of the Union: "1. The divine inspiration and authority of the Holy Scripture as the supreme and sufficient rule of our faith and practice; and the right and duty of individual judgment in the interpretation of it. 2. The fallen and sinful state of man. 3. The deity, the incarnation, the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, and His sacrificial and mediatorial work. 4. Justification by faith,—a faith that works by love and produces holiness. 5. The work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of sinners, and in the sanctification of all who believe. 6. The resurrection; the judgment of the Last Day, according to the words of our Lord in Matt. xxv. 46."

Since the days of Robert Hall the most conspicuous light of the Baptist pulpit in England has been Charles H. Spurgeon. Inducted into his work in London in 1853, before he had yet reached his twentieth year, he became immediately one of the most famous preachers of the metropolis. Moving wholly in the circle of evangelical thinking, combining a good fund of common sense with a certain wealth of manly feeling, and exhib-

iting an organizing talent which has made his church a centre for a whole group of religious enterprises, he has undoubtedly exercised a very wide influence, though he could hardly be placed among the foremost theologians of the age if he were to be judged on the score of intellectual depth and subtlety.

In the controversy between open and close communion, Spurgeon arrayed himself on the side of the former. In compensation for this laxity, however, he displayed extra zeal for the maintenance of the essentials of the old orthodoxy. In the latter part of 1887 he proclaimed his withdrawal from the Baptist Union, because of the innovating opinions which some of its members had imbibed. His protest was framed in these emphatic terms: "As a matter of fact, believers in Christ's atonement are now in declared religious union with those who make light of it; believers in Holy Scripture are in confederacy with those who deny plenary inspiration; those who hold evangelical doctrine are in open alliance with those who call the fall a fable, who deny the personality of the Holy Ghost, who call justification by faith immoral, and hold that there is another probation after death, and a future restitution for the lost. . . . To be very plain, we are unable to call these things Christian Unions; they begin to look like Confederacies in Evil." In the absence of more specific evidence, it will not be uncharitable to either party to assume that this impeachment is not strictly judicial, that it bears in truth somewhat of the coloring which hyper-orthodoxy is wont to give to its representation of more liberal opinions.

The century has witnessed no inconsiderable growth

in the Baptist communion. At the beginning of the closing decade their numbers in the United Kingdom, including the Channel Islands, had risen to about three hundred thousand.

In the Congregational churches of England the feature of independency was made prominent at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Little provision existed for associated action. There was indeed some agitation for a general union of ministers and churches as early as 1806, but definite results were first obtained about twenty-five years later, when the "Congregational Union" was formally instituted. In 1833 a declaration was put forth which was understood to be representative in general of the Congregational churches, though not binding upon them. While the Calvinistic peculiarities respecting predestination and perseverance have a place in the confession, they are sheathed in as mild language as could well be chosen. As to the more recent attitude toward this creed, the words of H. M. Dexter, written in 1879, may be taken as an index. "It may be doubted," he says, "whether, even with the liberal allowance for dissent which it includes, the declaration of 1833 would now be the preference of the body. On a single point some English Congregational churches have no doubt drifted from what American Congregationalists, it is believed in their overwhelming majority, still regard as so clearly the teaching of the Word as to be held indispensable to its loyal acceptance; namely, the doctrine of the future eternal punishment of those who die impenitent. Two facts seem to be clear with regard to this matter in England: the one of a considerable

relaxing of the ancient faith, either in the direction of annihilation, or of restoration through further probation ; the other that this ‘questioning or rejection of the old view of everlasting punishment is not connected with any conscious weakening of attachment and devotion to evangelical truth’ ; and in most cases ‘the deeds of Congregational chapels still affirm, in a condensed form, the distinguishing points of the ancient evangelical system,’ as those which for substance of doctrine must in good faith be taught therein, to maintain legal title to the premises.”¹

The roll of honor for the Congregationalists of Britain during the century contains many eminent rather than a few pre-eminent names. Morrison, McAll, Wardlaw, Vaughan, Stoughton, Fairbairn, Legge, and Dale are among those who have earned a full measure of esteem.

Presbyterianism in England has secured in the nineteenth century at least a partial compensation for the lapse of the Presbyterian body into Unitarianism in the preceding century. A faithful remnant of the old communion has been supplemented by an influx from various Presbyterian bodies in Scotland. By a union of two divisions of the Presbyterians in England in 1876, a communion bearing the name of the Presbyterian Church of England, and numbering at that time fifty thousand members, was formed.

The Unitarians at a recent date counted about three hundred churches in England and Wales. Since the early part of the century the animus of the body has

¹ Congregationalism as seen in its Literature, p. 675.

been not a little changed. A more ideal philosophy has largely usurped the place of the crass sensationalism taught by Priestley, and in place of the old rationalism, with its combination of a deistic leaning with formal supernaturalism, we observe ways of thinking which unite stress upon the divine immanence with much freedom in Biblical criticism. Influences from New England and Germany helped to work the transformation. In point of intellectual leadership James Martineau has occupied a foremost place among English Unitarians in recent times. His name is spoken with reverence by great numbers who are far from adopting all of his theological views.

The spirit of the age has not favored the increase of the Quakers, and has besides blunted the edge of their peculiarities. In customs and methods of religious work they are not so widely separated from their neighbors as formerly. However, a fair degree of steadiness in belief seems to have been maintained in the body. The rationalizing scheme of the American Hicks found little acceptance with the English Quakers, and was emphatically disowned by the Yearly Meeting of 1829. One section of the body, impelled by zeal against the Hicksite tenets, began to qualify the function of the inner light as compared with written revelation, and also to argue in favor of the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist. The result was a considerable agitation, a separation of a small party under the leadership of Isaac Crewdson, and their ultimate absorption in other communions. In the field of practical benevolence the Quakers have made honorable additions to their former record.

The labors of Elizabeth Fry were continued well into the century, and the London chemist William Allan won a kindred distinction as an exponent of Christian charity. In one part of his career we find exhibited something of that romantic character which distinguished Quaker evangelism in the earlier days. In company with Stephen Grellet, from the United States, he made a tour of religious visitation through Europe, not neglecting the Czar at St. Petersburg, Mohammedan dignitaries in Constantinople, and the Pope at Rome. As has been truly said, “No more remarkable and surprising journey was ever made since apostolic days, if even then.”¹ That Quaker antecedents and training are not incompatible with the gift of tongues — using that phrase in the better of modern senses — has been sufficiently demonstrated by the oratory of John Bright.

The protest against ecclesiasticism which was characteristic of the primitive Quakers was taken up between 1820 and 1830 by a party which is known as the Plymouth Brethren. In their view church constitutions and denominational fences were unholy things, which should be put away. They held further that the distinction between clergy and laity ought to be abolished, though sacramental rites should be retained. As is apt to be the case in like procedures, the formal protest against sectarianism ran into not a little of sectarian asperity. For the rest, a strained theory of imputed righteousness, which makes the continued existence of the old Adam in the true believer no bar to his perfect standing before the divine tribunal, is a prominent point in the belief of the Plymouth Brethren. Herein they

¹ Cunningham, History of the Quakers.

follow the teaching of John Darby, who has been one of their most influential leaders. They also lay much stress upon the visible advent and personal reign of Christ upon earth, as means of bringing the nations under His sceptre.

A better step toward Christian unity than that proposed by the Plymouth Brethren in their levelling scheme was taken in 1846, through the founding, at a great meeting in London, of the Evangelical Alliance. Without interfering with denominational integrity, the Alliance was designed to promote fraternal sentiments among Protestants, and to aid in the defence of religious freedom. As a doctrinal basis, the following specifications were adopted: "1. The divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures. 2. The unity of the Godhead, and the trinity of the Persons therein. 3. The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall. 4. The incarnation of the Son of God, His work of atonement, and His mediatorial intercession and reign. 5. The justification of the sinner by faith alone. 6. The work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner. 7. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. 8. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the authority and perpetuity of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper. 9. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked." Some opposition was expressed to the eighth article, as excluding the Quakers.

The ninth also provoked a measure of dissent, it being doubted by several whether an expression on the eternal lot of the wicked was necessary in a general basis of Christian fellowship. In practice, a very rigid adherence to the doctrinal platform has not been exacted, and occasionally persons who have not subscribed thereto have been invited to take part in the meetings of the organization.

Near the time that the Evangelical Alliance was instituted, another form of association, which also crossed denominational lines, was set on foot in London. As a means of uniting young men in Christian work, and providing for their social and mental, as well as their religious needs, the Young Men's Christian Association was started.

Some of the more important facts respecting the Roman Catholic wing of Dissenters have been given in the account of the Tractarian movement. That movement, judged by the distinction and rank of those who were borne into the Romish camp, was a very serviceable ally of the Pope. But no proportionate following went with the persons of eminence. While there has been a large increase of Roman Catholics since 1829, much of it must be credited to immigration rather than to converts from the Protestant population.

Considerable agitation was caused in 1850 by the action of the Pope in restoring the Romish hierarchy in England. The jealousy which was naturally excited by the reappearing shadow of papal pretension and sovereignty was not at all soothed by the manner in which the new archbishop, Wiseman, announced the unwel-

come measure. "Catholic England," he wrote from Rome, "has been restored to its orbit in the ecclesiastical firmament, from which its light had long vanished, and begins now anew its course of regularly adjusted action round the centre of unity, the source of jurisdiction, of light, and of unity." Earnest denunciation followed. But explanations were offered, and after a temporary outburst public feeling was quieted.

V.—CHURCH POLITY AND RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN SCOTLAND.

The ascendancy of the Moderates in the Scottish Church was broken in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, and the Evangelicals, now aided by the prestige of distinguished leaders, began to claim a majority in the General Assembly.

As a party, the Evangelicals were inclined to emphasize, the relative independence of the Church, or its autonomy in relation to its own affairs. Those, on the other hand, who followed the traditions of the Moderates, were more tolerant of an Erastian mode of church administration. As this mode was congenial to the thought of the British ministry and Parliament, it had the advantage in an appeal to state authority. Thus, the sentiments of a majority of the Scottish clergy and people were likely to be affronted and thwarted. Herein the conditions were made ready for collision and disruption.

The impulse to the collision came from that old vexation, the question of patronage. In 1834 the Assembly passed an act which was of the nature of a limitation

upon the power of the patron, providing that the heads of families in a parish might veto his nomination. Shortly afterwards the validity of this act was brought to a test. The decisions rendered by the secular tribunals were adverse. At the same time various trespasses upon the jurisdiction of the Church took place. The attempt of the Assembly to discipline a number of the ministers was nullified by the Court of Session. The same authority also undertook to interdict preaching within a given territory to all except specified individuals. Dissatisfaction naturally ran high. A large proportion of the clergy came to the conclusion that the aid which the Church received from the State was no adequate compensation for the independence sacrificed. They determined therefore to resign their positions, and place themselves outside of the Establishment. At the Assembly of 1843 notice was given that their benefices might be considered vacant. Four hundred and seventy-four ministers signed the deed of demission. As a proportionate fraction of the people heartily approved their act, their confidence was not belied. Five hundred chapels had been built for the Free Church of Scotland by the end of the first year of its existence.

The most prominent leader in the disruption was a man who has won an esteem throughout the length and breadth of Scotland which scarcely another has been able to rival in recent times. Both as respects the influence which he exercised during his life and the honor which has attached to his name since his death, Thomas Chalmers stands in the front rank of Scottish theologians. In the various positions which he filled, as preacher and pastor at Glasgow (1815–1823), as pro-

fessor of moral philosophy in the University of St. Andrews, as professor of divinity in the University of Edinburgh, he commanded an extraordinary degree of enthusiastic interest. It speaks not a little for the extent of his reputation in his own generation, that he received the singular honor of being appointed a corresponding member of the Royal Institute of France; and we are impressed with the fact that his laurels have not yet faded, when we find a recent biographer pronouncing him "the most important and influential personality that has sprung up in Scotland for at least two hundred years."¹

If we look at the title of his fame, we find that it does not rest upon an exceptional degree of literary genius or philosophical profundity. The esteem and reverence with which his memory has been crowned are due rather to an impression of manly strength, dignity, and worth, produced by a unique balance of faculties. We see in him at once the qualities of the effective orator, the clear-sighted statesman, the discreet philanthropist, the rock-like champion of principle, a union of force and common sense, of loftiness and simplicity, which is always an authentic certificate of leadership.

The pulpit oratory of Chalmers was not a very high specimen of grace and finish; but it had a convincing force, and was especially adapted to take captive a Scotch audience. "I have heard," says Lockhart, "very many deliver sermons far more uniform in elegance both of conception and style; but most unquestionably I have never heard, either in England or Scotland, or in any other country, any preacher whose eloquence is

¹ Donald Fraser, 1881.

capable of producing an effect so strong and irresistible as his.”¹ Carlyle, though he speaks very disparagingly of the erudition of Chalmers, evidently thought highly both of his general ability and his oratorical gift, as may be judged from this sketch: “He was a man of much natural dignity, ingenuity, honesty, and kind affection, as well as sound intellect and imagination. A very eminent vivacity lay in him, which could rise to complete impetuosity,—growing conviction, passionate eloquence, fiery play of heart and head,—all in a kind of *rustic* type, one might say, though wonderfully true and tender. . . . I suppose there will never again be such a preacher in any Christian Church.”²

As an outgrowth of his keen and broad common sense, Chalmers possessed scarcely less of sober business faculty than of oratorical talent. Proof of this was given in the unwonted vigor with which the enterprise of church extension was carried forward when it came under his leadership. Largely through his instrumentality over two hundred new churches were added to the Establishment in the course of a few years. Still more signal was the proof which he gave by so directing the finances of the Free Church that from the start its ministers had a fair security against want, even when laboring amid poor and scanty populations. Something of the same aptitude for practical activity was shown in his plans and efforts for the evangelization of the unchurched poor in the cities. He was no friend of the official dole. The Church, as he claimed, ought to come into intimate contact with this class, invading its terri-

¹ Quoted by Fraser, p. 44.

² Reminiscences, pp. 126, 127.

tory with persistent and organized effort, teaching, encouraging, and directing the indigent, and promoting in them a spirit of self-help. Both in Glasgow and Edinburgh he gave a worthy specimen of what he deemed the proper method of home missionary work.

The name of Chalmers is not associated with any theological peculiarities. He was content with the general framework of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession. As respects polity, he occupied a liberal position, not regarding any one form as having exclusive right. He favored the idea of an Establishment, and by request delivered in its defence a course of lectures in London, which won extraordinary applause. This has sometimes been counted inconsistent with the part which he took in the great secession from the Scotch Establishment in 1843. But a closer view will show that Chalmers was entirely consistent here. As appears in the London lectures themselves, he was never tolerant of a connection with the State which should hamper the Church in its proper functions as a religious organization. The chief advantage which he associated with an Establishment was its capability of providing every part of the country, however poor, with religious ministrations. When he went out of the Scotch Establishment he still kept this end in mind, and sought to secure it by means of a central sustentation fund.

While Chalmers was preaching in Glasgow he had as assistant, for a season, a young man whose genius for pulpit address was of no usual order. This was Edward Irving, who became preacher of the Caledonian church in London in 1822. In the metropolis his fame rose rapidly, and large throngs, from curiosity or admiration,

attended his ministrations. The singular style of his preaching has thus been described : "It is a strange blending of exposition, exhortation, poetry, pathos, and scorn ; now, in lofty speculation, speeding like a meteor high overhead ; now, as though it were the forked lightning, cleaving at our very side some hoary erection of human fraud or folly ; and now melting in the softest tears of human sympathy."¹ Carlyle remarks : "Irving's discourses were far more opulent in ingenious thought than Chalmers', which indeed were usually the triumphant on-rush of *one* idea with its satellites and supporters. But Irving's wanted in definite *head* and *backbone*, so that on arriving you might see clearly where and how. That was mostly a defect one felt in traversing those grand forest avenues of his, with their multifarious outlooks to right and left."²

With a great fund of kindness, Irving united a genuine devotion. But he was somewhat lacking in mental poise. His leaning to mysticism, which provoked the apprehension of Chalmers, left him ill-guarded against religious eccentricity. He gave too ready an ear to those who were ambitious to unfold the mysteries of prophecy, and was led to overvalue the miracle as a means of advancing Christianity. Accordingly, when a strange spirit of prophesying broke out in his congregation (1831), he encouraged it, under the supposition that the gift of tongues had been renewed.

The phenomenon appears to have been analogous to the various forms of overpowering physical impressions, which have occurred in seasons of great religious excite-

¹ Charteris, in St. Giles Lectures.

² Reminiscences, p. 128.

ment. "The actual utterances," says the biographer of Irving, "as they were introduced in the full congregation, were short exhortations, warnings, or commands, in English, preceded by some sentences or exclamations in the *tongue*, which was not the primary message, being unintelligible, but only the sign of inspiration. The character of the sound itself has perhaps received as many different descriptions as there are persons who have heard it. To some the ecstatic exclamations, with their rolling syllables and mighty voice, were imposing and awful; to others it was merely gibberish shouted from stentorian lungs; to others an uneasy wonder, which it was a relief to find passing into English, even though the height and strain of sound were undiminished."¹

The babel of strange voices at the Caledonian church was a source of derision to some and of grief to others. The matter tended seriously to compromise the position of Irving. In 1832 he was excluded from his pulpit, and the following year he was deposed from the ministry by the Presbytery of Annan. An alleged heresy on the subject of christology — namely, the view that Christ, though actually sinless, took corrupt human nature — was the expressed ground of the deposition. Worn out by agitation and misfortune, Irving died near the close of 1834.

The movement which was started in the Caledonian church in London issued in the founding of the so called "Catholic Apostolic Church," which has gathered a number of congregations on the Continent as well as in England. Aiming to reproduce in its entirety

¹ Mrs. Oliphant, Life of Edward Irving, p. 430.

the primitive Christian ministry, the Catholic Apostolic Church has apostles, prophets, evangelists, angels (or bishops), presbyters, and deacons. It holds to the continuance of the apostolic charisms, and emphasizes the speedy coming of Christ. Its worship is of a highly ritualistic cast, its theory of the sacraments akin to that of the High Church party in the Anglican Establishment.

Among the writers who diverged from the beaten path of Scotch theology before the middle of the century, Thomas Erskine of Linlathen and Macleod Campbell have attracted special attention. Like Schleiermacher and Coleridge, and independently of them, Erskine was an "apostle of the inner consciousness." The credentials of Christianity he found chiefly in the internal evidences, or in the manner in which, when truly contemplated, its truths and facts approve themselves to the human spirit. In some of his particular views he anticipated Maurice, who confessed his obligations to the saintly layman. The following passages, for example, will have a familiar sound to one who has read the works of Maurice : "Unbelief is the far country : we never move out of our Father's hand ; and as soon as we know Him as He is revealed in Jesus, we know ourselves to be in our Father's house. . . . When it is said that Christ does this or that thing for us, it is not meant that He did or does them as our substitute, but as our head. He does them for us as a root does things for the branches, or as a head or heart does things for the body. . . . Christ suffered for a purpose directly opposed to the purpose which is implied in the doctrine of substitution ; He suffered not to dispense with our suffering, but to enable us to suffer, as He did, to the glory of God

and to the purification of our natures. . . . I do not mean to say that any amount of suffering is necessary to salvation. It is the suffering spirit of Jesus in us that is necessary. . . . Christ's sufferings made the atonement, because through them the life was let into the body; through them Christ became the head of life to the body, and it is only by that life that we can lovingly receive our punishment, putting to our seal that God is righteous in it. . . . God has a personal tender affection for every man, so that He desires union and fellowship with every man. Now the Son declared this love of the Father, by coming into the *root* of the nature, that part which Adam occupied, and thus coming into every man, and thus testifying to the Father's loving desire of union with every man.”¹

The thinking of Macleod Campbell, though not identical in all respects with that of Erskine, had a similar cast. He magnified the love of God, claimed that an arbitrary direction or limitation of love is fatal to its very conception, and affirmed accordingly that Christ truly died for all. The theory of satisfaction by penal sufferings was repugnant to his feeling, and in place of it he viewed Christ as the new head of the race, offering in its behalf a perfect confession, or presenting a perfect ethical response to the divine condemnation of sin. The teaching of Campbell was challenged, and he was deposed from the ministry by the Assembly of 1831,—an act which has been characterized as “the stoning by the Church of her best prophet.”²

¹ The Brazen Serpent.

² Principal Shairp, quoted by Tulloch, Movements of Religious Thought in Britain.

Of the two great representatives of literature from Scotland in the nineteenth century, Sir Walter Scott very likely has come the nearer to the heart of the Scotch people. Still, his narrative genius can hardly be credited with as great effect in the world at large as the blended criticism and imagination of Thomas Carlyle. By his gospel of work and his mortal hatred of shams Carlyle has afforded a healthy tonic to not a few minds. While he has not given due credit to his own age, he has held up a mirror into which the age has found it profitable to look once and again.

In point of religious faith, Carlyle, if not an exponent of an ample creed, was not a representative of indifference or sheer unbelief. He had no friendship for purely naturalistic schemes or crass materialisms, and stigmatized such as "mud philosophies." Comte and his Positivism he characterized as "the miserablest phantasmal *algebraic ghost*" that he had met with among the ranks of the living. Perhaps the most positive element in his faith was his conviction respecting the presence and agency of an all-ruling Providence. Far as he was from the ordinary dialect of Christian piety, he has left no reason to doubt his resolute hold upon this part of religious belief. Surely the humblest saint could not express completer resignation to a higher power than is contained in these words of Carlyle, written after the shock of the news that a mischance had reduced to ashes his manuscript on the French Revolution: "Oh that I had faith! Oh that I had it! Then were there nothing too hard or heavy for me. Cry silently to thy inmost heart, to God, for it. Surely He will give it thee. At all events, it is as if my invisible schoolmaster had

torn my copybook when I showed it, and said, ‘No, boy ! thou must write it better.’ What can I, sorrowing, do but obey,—obey, and think it the best ?” What appears here in the concrete appears as a general maxim in his address before the University of Edinburgh. “I believe,” he said to the students, “you will find in all histories that religion has been at the head and foundation of them all, and that no nation that did not contemplate this wonderful universe with an awe-stricken and reverential feeling that there was a great unknown, omnipotent, and all-wise and all-virtuous Being, superintending all men in it and all interests in it,—no nation ever came to very much, nor did any man either, who forgot that.”

In view of such statements, it may be said that Carlyle had a vivid sense of the supernatural. He thought of this, however, as incarnating itself in nature and man, and working through ordinary processes. His point of view is indicated in these words, written on the eve of his undertaking the composition of the French Revolution : “That the supernatural differs not from the natural is a great truth, which the last century (especially in France) has been engaged in demonstrating. The philosophers went far wrong, however, in this, that, instead of raising the natural to the supernatural, they strove to sink the supernatural to the natural. The gist of my whole way of thought is to do not the latter, but the former.”

In general, Carlyle was hostile to great definiteness in representing the objects of religious thought and feeling. Theological definitions seemed to him to circumscribe and to belittle. He preferred for himself a certain

vagueness. His thought of God had accordingly an uncertain outline, being neither distinctly pantheistic nor steadfastly theistic. Most satisfactory to him it may have been ; but it is no rash induction which enforces the conclusion that, in respect of power over the common mind and heart of man, it is a poor substitute for the theistic and Christian conception of God as Personal Love and Personal Righteousness.

In recent theological activity, Scotland has been taking at least a proportionate share. While W. Robertson Smith was thought by many of the clergy to have passed the line of tolerance in his departure from traditional views of the Old Testament, the spirit of criticism and research has not slumbered. The names of John Tulloch and Alexander B. Bruce are representative of no inconsiderable list of scholars who have shown a worthy aptitude for combining a critical with a conservative spirit.

VI.—IRELAND.

The legislative union between England and Ireland, which was enacted in 1800, though not approved by all the Roman Catholics of the latter country, was welcomed by a large proportion of them. The prelates generally offered no opposition to the measure. It was doubtless regarded as likely to facilitate the attainment of full civil equality for the adherents of the Romish religion. At any rate a change of attitude was apparent after 1829, when Parliament was opened to Roman Catholics. From that date the agitation for the repeal of the Union, which had been inaugurated by Daniel

O'Connell, was supported, to a noticeable extent, by the priests.

The Ultramontane propagandism, which was characteristic of the pontificate of Pius IX., was not tardy in showing itself in Ireland. In 1849, the Pope, setting aside the nominees of the Irish clergy, advanced by his sole will Paul Cullen, Rector of the Irish College at Rome, to the see of Armagh. Three years later he was made Archbishop of Dublin. The reason of this choice is no secret. Paul Cullen was put at the head of the Irish priesthood as a vigorous champion of Ultramontane principles. He was expected to overcome liberal tendencies and to make the Irish hierarchy a true annex to the Vatican.

The new spirit which Cullen diffused was soon manifested in relation to the subject of public education. In 1831 a national system had been devised, founded on the principle of united secular education, combined with separate religious instruction. Some years later a joint system of higher education was provided, on the same plan, in the Queen's Colleges at Cork, Galway, and Belfast. Before the arrival of Cullen, the government scheme had been favorably received by the Roman Catholics, and some of their bishops, serving as commissioners, had worked harmoniously with Protestant colleagues. But forthwith a decided change was manifest. As early as 1850 the Queen's Colleges were condemned by a synod acting under papal direction, though it would seem with but partial effect, since Romish students continued to be in attendance. As respects elementary education, connection with the national system was not indeed dissolved ; nevertheless that system began to be

derided in principle, and the denominational theory, which allows the State to supply the funds, but insists that the Church shall be sovereign over the instruction, was industriously inculcated.

At the Vatican Council, Paul Cullen made an agreeable return to Pius IX. for his advancement, by his advocacy of papal infallibility. The aged McHale, on the other hand, testified for the faith of Ireland more in accordance with declarations which had been put forth near the end of the eighteenth and in the early part of the nineteenth century.

The spread of Ultramontane tenets in Ireland, and their elevation to the rank of dogma by the Vatican Council, have naturally inclined Irish Protestants to look with grave doubts upon the project of Home Rule. With much unanimity, the General Assembly of the Presbyterians declared against the bill brought forward by Gladstone in 1886, which proposed a separate Parliament for Ireland. Among the considerations which dictated this vote of the Presbyterian clergy, doubtless the relation of the Pope to Irish affairs was not the least influential. They had in mind such a picture as an able representative of their body had sketched some years before, in these words : "The Pope appoints the bishops ; the bishops appoint the priests ; and the priests rule the people with absolute dominion. The Irish peasant may choose his medical attendant or his law adviser ; he may vote for a coroner or a member of Parliament ; but he has no more influence in the nomination of the spiritual guide to whom he is required to commit his deepest secrets, than has the sheep which he shears, or the donkey which he drives to market.

In matters of religion he must not dare even to think for himself. He must believe, without challenge, whatever his Church believes. Irishmen who talk loudly of the blessings of Home Rule patiently crouch under this unmitigated Italian slavery.”¹ More recently, also, tokens of decided hostility to the Home Rule scheme have been given by Irish Protestants.

Before the installation of Paul Cullen, Bishop Doyle, of the see of Kildare and Leighlin, was the most influential of the Romish prelates. He was distinguished at once by vigor in administration and by dexterity in controversy. Though it appears that he thought it necessary to put the reading of the Bible under bonds,² he was in general a man of somewhat liberal sentiments.

In point of popular influence the most remarkable ecclesiastic of this era was the Capuchin friar, Theobald Mathew, the Apostle of Temperance. The reform had been started in 1829 by Professor Edgar of Belfast. In 1838 Father Mathew, who had much endeared himself to the people by his self-denying benevolence, was incited by the Quaker, William Martin, to place himself at the head of the new movement. The results forthwith

¹ Killen, Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, ii. 550, 551.

² In opposition to Bible distribution he wrote : “I deem the reading of the Scriptures by the weak and ignorant, such as children are, whether with or without comments, *an abuse always to be deprecated*; but such reading of them in this country, at this time and in the present circumstances, I consider an abuse filled with danger,—not only an evil, but *an evil of great magnitude*.” (Killen, ii. 422.) As a proper antithesis to this we may quote the following words of a contemporary writer : “Would I then withhold the Bible from the cottager and the artisan? Heaven forefend! The fairest flower that ever clomb up a cottage window is not so fair a sight to my eyes as the Bible gleaming through the lower panes.” (Coleridge, Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit.)

mounted beyond the most sanguine expectations. In a few years Father Mathew gave the temperance pledge, it is supposed, to about two millions, mostly Roman Catholics. Between 1839 and 1843, the consumption of whiskey descended below half of the preceding rate, and there was a corresponding decrease in the statistics of crime, as also a great increase in the deposits of savings banks. Had the transformation been as permanent as it was extensive, it would have been an inestimable boon to Ireland. As it was, no inconsiderable amount of good was accomplished.

There has been an absolute decline since the early part of the nineteenth century in the number both of Romanists and Protestants in Ireland, but a moderate relative gain on the part of the latter. In 1834 the Romanists numbered 6,427,712, the Protestants 1,516,228. In 1871, the former numbered 4,141,933, the latter 1,260,568. Between these dates came the great famine of 1846, in consequence of which Ireland lost by death or emigration, in the course of four or five years, about one third of her population.

The disestablishment of the Episcopal Church, which went into effect the first day of 1871, was not due to any special failure on its part in the preceding years. On the contrary, it had presented an improved record since the early part of the century. The disestablishment was due rather to a wide-spread sense of the unfitness of discriminating in favor of a Church which included only a small minority of the people.

In religious tone the Episcopal Church of Ireland has been largely evangelical in recent times. It seems to have received the leaven of Tractarianism very slowly.

A representative, writing about 1872, has given this description of its status: "The Church in Ireland is marvellously homogeneous in doctrine and sentiment, and free from the extremes of party feeling and opinion which exist within the pale of the English Church. This may be in part the consequence of the power of Romanism in Ireland. In England, where it is comparatively little known, men of high intellect and refined taste have been attracted to the Roman Church, or rather to an ideal Church of their own imagination which they identified with it. In Ireland, though there have been a few such cases, the majority have been influenced by a violent repulsion from the Roman Catholic Church. Of course there are in Ireland High Churchmen and Low Churchmen; and it is a great mistake to imagine the Irish Church to be that low level swamp of Puritanism which some in England imagine it to be. But all sections of the Church are united in a steady opposition to the claims and power of the Church of Rome. They have the union of men who feel that they are face to face with a common danger, and an enemy who is ever ready to profit by their divisions and mistakes. Ritualism (properly so called) has no sympathizing party in Ireland; and though the majority of the Irish clergy and laity belong distinctly to the Evangelical School, it may be doubted whether a meeting could be got together anywhere in Ireland in which the speakers would harp upon the merits of a black gown."¹

The doctrinal phase upon which the English Presbyterians had started adrift made its appearance among

¹ J. C. Macdonnel, in *The Church and the Age*, 2d Series, edited by Weir and Maclagan.

the Presbyterians of Ireland a century later. About the close of the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the Synod of Ulster discovered that some of its members were infected with Arianism. This discovery incited to a movement in favor of more rigid tests of the orthodoxy of candidates for the ministry. The result, as no doubt was desired by the leaders in the movement, among whom Dr. Henry Cooke was the most prominent, was the separation of the Arians. Seventeen ministers withdrew in 1829, and assumed the name of Remonstrants. A few years later, the Synod decided to insist strictly upon subscription to the Westminster Confession. This action prepared for a union with the Synod of the Secession Church, which emigrants from Scotland had planted in Ireland near the middle of the preceding century. The union was consummated in 1840. The composite body assumed the name of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. At that date it had 433 congregations. In 1871 it numbered 553 congregations, and had under its care about half a million of people.

One of the most notable events in the later history of the Irish Presbyterians was the great revival of 1859. It was a profound awakening, in which, as in the Wesleyan revival in England, strange physical phenomena were often incidental to genuine conviction and conversion.

VII.—PHASES OF SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY IN BRITAIN.

The scientific induction having the most far-reaching effect of any in the century is doubtless that which is expressed in the doctrine of evolution. This doctrine

was made a matter of general attention by the publication of Darwin's "Origin of Species," in 1859. Within the limits of a generation, the evolutionary hypothesis gained the acceptance of most scientists, though not always in the Darwinian form, with its special stress upon the instrumentality of "natural selection," or the principle of "the survival of the fittest."

If we ask how far the actual proof in favor of evolution extends, we find that it fairly establishes the fact of mutation of species within certain limits. As for the descent of all species from a common type, the evidence affords at most suggestion, not decisive proof. Science has no real insight into the capability of the processes which have effected ascertained variations of species to produce such vast changes as are implied in the transition from one kingdom or sub-kingdom of living forms to another. It is the advantage of a unified and connected view of the whole circle of the organic world, rather than any complete proof, which commends the theory of evolution, in its broad sense, to the scientist.

As respects its religious bearing, the doctrine of evolution is not necessarily held in the interest of sheer naturalism, or in opposition to genuine theism. This is well illustrated in recent remarks of one of the stanchest advocates of the Darwinian theory in its main elements. "There are at least three stages," he says, "in the development of the organic world, when some new cause or power must necessarily have come into action. The first stage is the change from inorganic to organic, when the earliest vegetable cell, or the living protoplasm out of which it arose, first appeared. This is often imputed to mere increase of complexity of

chemical compounds; but increase of complexity, with consequent instability, even if we admit that it may have produced protoplasm as a chemical compound, could certainly not have produced *living* protoplasm,—protoplasm which has the power of growth and reproduction, and of that continuous process of development which has resulted in the marvellous variety and complex organization of the whole vegetable kingdom. There is in all this something quite beyond and apart from chemical changes, however complex.

“The next stage is still more marvellous, still more completely beyond all possibility of explanation by matter, its laws and forces. It is the introduction of sensation or consciousness, constituting the fundamental distinction between the animal and vegetable kingdoms. Here all idea of mere complication of structure producing the result is out of the question. We feel it to be altogether preposterous to assume that, at a certain stage of complexity of atomic constitution, and as a necessary result of that complexity alone, an *ego* should start into existence, a thing that *feels*, that is *conscious* of its own existence. Here we have the certainty that something new has arisen, a being whose nascent consciousness has gone on increasing in power and definiteness till it has culminated in the higher animals. No verbal explanation or attempt at explanation — such as the statement that life is the result of the molecular forces of the protoplasm, or that the whole existing organic universe, from the amœba up to man, was latent in the fire-mist from which the solar system was developed — can afford any mental satisfaction, or help us in any way to a solution of the mystery.

"The third stage is the existence in man of a number of his most characteristic and noblest faculties, those which raise him furthest above the brutes, and open up possibilities of almost indefinite advancement. These faculties could not possibly have been developed by the same laws which have determined the progressive development of the organic world in general, and also of man's physical organism.

"These three distinct stages of progress from the inorganic world of matter and motion up to man point clearly to an unseen universe,—to a world of spirit, to which the world of matter is altogether subordinate. To this spiritual world we may refer the marvellously complex forces which we know as gravitation, cohesion, chemical force, radiant force, and electricity, without which the material universe could not exist for a moment in its present form, and perhaps not at all, since without these forces, and perhaps others which may be termed atomic, it is doubtful whether matter itself could have any existence. And still more surely can we refer to it those progressive manifestations of life in the vegetable, the animal, and man, which we may classify as unconscious, conscious, and intellectual life, and which probably depend upon different degrees of influx."¹

Evolutionism of a realistic type, such as is expressed in Darwinism and cognate theories, had been preceded by an idealistic evolutionism. Of this latter the Hegelian system was the most elaborate specimen. In the recent philosophy of Britain, the former type may have been the most conspicuous factor, but the Hegelian speculation has also left an impress. Before the impact of

¹ A. R. Wallace, *Darwinism*, 1889, pp. 474-476.

either had produced any definite results, a phase of philosophy which rests back upon Hume and Locke had its school in England. It will be necessary, therefore, in tracing the philosophical current, to go back of its juncture with the theory of evolution.

The school to which we refer was represented by James Mill and his son, John Stuart Mill, the latter being its most fertile writer. In its underlying postulates it savored of extreme empiricism and sensationalism. It made no account of an original content or source of ideas in the mind, derived all intellectual products from sensation, explained necessary beliefs by the power of association, and discredited at once the substantiality of mind and its freedom, thus making it a necessitated chain of sensations.

In the hands of John Stuart Mill this scheme scarcely came short of confessed failure. "If we speak of the mind," he says, "as a series of feelings, we are obliged to complete the statement by calling it a series of feelings which is aware of itself as past and future; and we are reduced to the alternative of believing that the mind, or ego, is something different from any series of feelings, or possibilities of them, or of accepting the paradox that something which *ex hypothesi* is but a series of feelings can be aware of itself as a series."¹ In view of this insurmountable difficulty, it would have been creditable in Mill to have abandoned his definition of mind, and thus to have changed the base of his philosophy. He might also have found adequate occasion for amendment of his system in the fact that he could not see his way clear to maintain his denial of innate principles or fixed

¹ Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy.

data of thought, except as he questioned at the same time the certainty of even mathematical truths, and thus cut away the ground for all scientific confidence.

With the sensational philosophy a utilitarian theory of morals has commonly been conjoined. Jeremy Bentham, who began his career as an author in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, was a stalwart advocate of this theory. "Nature has placed mankind," he says, "under the governance of two sovereign masters, *pain* and *pleasure*. It is for them to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand, the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think."¹ Following in the path traced by Bentham, James Mill and John Stuart Mill have contended for the utilitarian, or hedonist, theory. The latter says, in exposition of the theory: "The creed which accepts, as the foundation of morals, *utility*, or the *greatest happiness principle*, holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness."² He remarks further: "To think of an object as desirable and to think of it as pleasant are one and the same thing; and to desire anything, except in proportion as the idea of it is pleasant, is a physical and metaphysical impossibility. . . . Will in the beginning is entirely produced by desire, including in that term the repelling influence of pain, as well as the attractive one of pleasure. . . . Will is the child of desire, and

¹ Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, p. 1.

² Utilitarianism.

passes out of the dominion of its parent only to come under that of habit."

As Mill in his psychology made admissions that contradict its validity, so in his theory of morals he has not kept the path of consistency. From the pursuit of happiness as a merely personal end he crosses over to the pursuit of the happiness of men generally, and makes utilitarianism to require the latter. But if, as appears in his system, happiness is the sole motive as well as the criterion of actions, a person can have actually no incentive to seek the happiness of others save as he identifies it with his own. Now suppose, as is often the fact, that one does not make this identification; what provision is there in Mill's philosophy for showing that he ought to make it? None whatever that can stand analysis. If pleasure is both the invincible motive and criterion of conduct, there can be nothing back or irrespective of it which can or ought to determine conduct. The truth is, the sensational utilitarian scheme gives no proper account of the sense of duty. The "greatest happiness principle," as ultimately interpreted by Mill in favor of *altruism*, may be a good maxim for practically directing the sense of duty; but of this sense of duty itself no satisfactory account has been given by him or by others standing on the same basis. Nor would it be reasonable to ask that it should be given. A real foundation of duty ought not to be required of a system which does not claim to afford even a foundation for genuine faith in mathematical truths.

In the foregoing comments we have expressed the gist of strictures which different English critics have

passed on the utilitarian theory. Among these James Martineau has written with much force and vivacity. The following sentences summarize his conclusions : “ It is but a sophistical slip of thought which carries the utilitarian from the principle ‘ Each for his own happiness ’ to that of ‘ Each for the happiness of all.’ Notwithstanding the provision in our nature for the partial conversion of interested into disinterested feeling, it is impossible to identify the greatest happiness of self with the greatest happiness of all concerned ; or, from the necessity of pursuing the former, to establish the claim of the latter ; or to extract a scheme of duty from rules of prudence ; or to make the motive of self-love, however rationally worked, suffice for building up a virtuous character. The moral consciousness of the individual mind comprises experiences which are not covered by the data and inferences of rational hedonism.”¹

As John Stuart Mill tended in a measure to outgrow the philosophy which he had inherited (though not really escaping its limitations), so he was inclined in his later years to transcend the negative attitude toward religion which characterized the larger part of his life. At the last he allowed a preponderance of evidence in favor of creation by design, confessed the admissibility — if not the clear foundation — of the hope of immortality, and taught that Christ might appropriately be taken as the ideal representative of humanity. These were his main concessions. On the other hand, he compromised the theistic conception by maintaining that both omnipotence and perfect benevolence cannot be ascribed to the Author

¹ *Types of Ethical Theory*, 2d edit., ii. 334–344.

of nature, betraying thus a leaning to a dualistic theory akin to the Manichæan.

The connection suggests a word respecting Sir William Hamilton, a representative of an eclectic philosophy which John Stuart Mill examined with some measure of apparent profit to his own thinking. The position of Hamilton has been defined by a German critic as follows: "He was indebted to both Reid and Kant; he endeavored to combine the realism of the former with the subjective criticism of the latter, but without any great success."¹ This statement may be accepted, if by lack of success is meant failure to weld philosophical elements into a system adapted by its firmness and consistency to command permanent influence and assent. Hamilton did not do this. His writings nevertheless served for a season as a marked stimulant to the speculative thinking of the English-speaking world.

In the latter part of the century the sensational philosophy has maintained partnership with the realistic type of evolutionism which had been commended to the favor of scientists by Darwin. Herbert Spencer has been perhaps the most industrious representative of this partnership. He finds in the doctrine of evolution a welcome relief from the necessity of making the principle of the association of ideas to work with such magical efficacy as uniformly to create invincible beliefs in a narrow space of time. Supposing the nervous organization to determine the facts of mental life, and presuming that the modifications of this organization which have been wrought by the experiences of antecedent individu-

¹ Otto Pfleiderer, *The Progress of Theology in Great Britain since 1825.*

als have been continuously transmitted, he provides, as he conceives, for the growth of necessary or intuitive beliefs by a long process. They have arisen, he says, not merely through such associations of ideas as we personally have made, but through such as have been made by a long line of ancestors. It is in this way that the intuition of space has arisen; in this way also that the faculty of moral intuition has been furnished to the human mind.

Though Mr. Spencer has written with much ingenuity, and has curtained his hypotheses with a fine verbal display, he has not been able to allay the suspicion that his evolutionary theory pushes back rather than overcomes the fundamental difficulty of the sensational scheme. As one or another critic has suggested, it is necessary to explain the possibility of the experience which is supposed to generate the faculties of intuition, without the anterior presence of some portion at least of that which is assumed to be generated. The enigma which confronted Mill, and which he left an enigma, stands no less against the system of Spencer. His principles do not provide for the unity of consciousness, without which rational experience is not conceivable. "He assumes," says an acute critic of the sensational philosophy, "certain elementary feelings, which are in fact nothing at all apart from determination in a system of self-consciousness, or in a correlative consciousness of nature, and to which both he and his readers really ascribe the character derived from such determination. He then traces a genesis out of them of the system which they presuppose. . . . Confusing succession of feelings with cognition of succession, changes of consciousness with consciousness

of change, he virtually supposes the feelings, as apart from it, to be that which they doubtless really are, but which they are only in relation to it. He then extracts from, as the result of their multiplication and through them the result of force, that unified consciousness which they must be in order to become.”¹ As still further illustrating Spencer’s evasion of the real problem, we add this comment of Pfleiderer: “When he speaks of change of states of consciousness as the result of changing impressions of force, he seeks to find the origin of consciousness in effects produced from without, which cannot, however, surely, be perceived as in succession and changed save by reference to previously existing consciousness; he really, therefore, presupposes consciousness as already inwardly present, while he seeks to explain it from external action. In fact, we must concur in the searching criticism of Green, that Spencer has not grasped the fundamental problem of the source and nature of knowledge, as it was proposed by Hume and solved by Kant in the synthetic function of the ego. Spencer supposes that Kant has been refuted by the new discovery of the doctrine of natural evolution, namely, that the supposed *a priori* or innate ideas which are considered to precede experience are in reality only the result of the experience of the race which the individual inherits. But Spencer here fails to perceive the real nature of the problem, which is, How is experience in any form possible? — a problem which remains unaltered whether the experience is that of the individual or the race, and to the solution of which no historical ‘psychogenesis’ of nature can contribute in the smallest

¹ Thomas Hill Green, Works, i. 438–440.

degree. And while his evolutionary psychology contributes nothing whatever towards the solution of the problem as to the nature of knowledge, Spencer really makes a solution of it impossible by degrading the relation of subject and object, the ego and non-ego, to a mere difference of degree in the strength or vividness of a series of sensations. An error so fundamental at the crucial point can do no other than produce a fatal effect upon the whole system built upon it. If a man fails to perceive in himself the active subject, the self-conscious mind, it cannot be expected of him that he should find it in the Absolute.”¹

To Spencer the Absolute is the incomprehensible background of the phenomenal world, the primordial Being which we are compelled to assume, which is in fact a “necessary datum of consciousness,” but of which we can know nothing, our knowledge being wholly of the finite and relative. Accordingly our thoughts of the Absolute are mere symbols which may serve the ends of religious devotion, but must not be credited with furnishing any true representation of the unknown God.

This species of agnosticism has thus been criticised by John Caird: “Mr. Spencer, first, in order to maintain that the Absolute is inconceivable, defines it as that which has no relation to thought; and then, in order not to annihilate it altogether, drags it back half over the boundary of the thinkable. But he cannot thus play fast and loose with the object of thought. It must be either thinkable or unthinkable,—wholly incogitable and therefore a sheer blank or nonentity, or capable of becoming, as truly as the finite, a real and positive,

¹ *The Progress of Theology in Great Britain since 1825.*

though indeed inexhaustible, object of thought.”¹ On the relation of Spencer’s theory to religious worship Caird remarks: “The worship of the Unknowable is really an impossible attitude of mind. The feelings of awe, reverence, humility, which are supposed to be called forth by the contemplation of that which lies beyond the limits of consciousness, are not legitimately due to such an object. . . . Religion by its very nature, contains, and must ever contain, an element of mystery; but a religion *all* mystery is an absurd and impossible notion. . . . In order to awaken humility and reverence, or indeed to awaken any emotion whatever, the object must be something more than the blank negation of thought. It is because we conceive of the unknown not as ‘a mystery absolutely and forever beyond our comprehension,’ but as containing more of what is admirable to us than we can grasp, because our intelligence is confronted by an object which is immeasurably above it in its own line, that there is awakened within us a sense of our own littleness in contrast with its greatness.”²

In Caird’s treatment of the philosophy of religion, the general outline of Hegel’s system may be discerned. Thomas Hill Green also speaks as though Hegel were the preferred philosophical master. Nevertheless, it is with questionable propriety that he can be styled a disciple of Hegel. He certainly had but small confidence in the ability of the Hegelian method to give an indubitable exposition of the universe as it really exists. “A well-grounded conviction,” he says, “has made men refuse to believe that any dialectic of the discursive

¹ Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion, pp. 35, 36.

² Pp. 27, 30, 31.

intelligence would instruct them in the reality of the world, or that this reality could consist in thought, in any sense in which thought can be identified with such an intellectual process. It may not, indeed, have been of the essence of Hegel, but an accident explicable from his philosophical antecedents, that his doctrine was presented in a form which affronted this conviction. That there is one spiritual self-conscious being, of which all that is real is the activity or expression ; that we are related to this spiritual being, not merely as parts of the world which is its expression, but as partakers in some inchoate measure of the self-consciousness through which it at once constitutes and distinguishes itself from the world ; that this participation is the source of morality and religion ; — this we take to be the vital truth which Hegel had to teach. It still remains to be presented in a form which will command some general acceptance among serious and scientific men. Whoever would so present it, though he cannot drink too deep of Hegel, should sit rather looser to the dialectical method than Dr. Caird has done.”¹ This distrust of the Hegelian dialectic exhibits Green, it seems to us, as being nearer in mental sympathy and tendency to Lotze than to Hegel.

The notion of evolution, whether in its realistic or idealistic type, in proportion as it has entered into the intellectual atmosphere of the age, naturally has acted in a measure upon theological thinking. Emphasizing the process more than the single act, it favors the contemplation of revelation as a gradual unfolding of divine thought in and through a great historic movement. It

¹ Works, iii. 146.

tends also to give prominence to the office of the Christian consciousness to progressively realize new truth, reaching beyond, not indeed the principles of the gospel, but the imperfect apprehension of their bearing and consequences which has characterized each Christian age. At this point it is doubtless easy to run into exaggeration and utopianism ; but the thorough investigator will be slow to deny that a large element of truth lies in the modified view of the mode and function of revelation.

As we have dealt only with prominent phases of philosophical thinking in Britain, we have of course paid no just tribute to many eminent writers. The names of Henry Calderwood, Robert Flint, John Cairns, Edward Caird, and others, would properly find a place in a closer and fuller survey of the field.

CHAPTER IV.

AMERICA SINCE THE COLONIAL ERA.

I.—THE EXPERIMENT OF A FREE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE founders of the Republic were debarred by several reasons from all thought of the union of Church and State. Their knowledge of history taught them that such a relation involved serious entanglements, and had been a prolific source of dissension, conflict, and oppression in European states. They found the country possessed by a number of religious denominations, between which there was no such inequality as to suggest the feasibility or propriety of placing one above the rest, and making it the favored communion, the national church. They held large views of personal liberty, and thought of government as rather a means of protecting the individual in his rights, and of giving expression to public intelligence in matters of common concern, than as a paternal institute, an authority set over a body of minors for the purpose of guiding and moulding them according to a prescribed pattern. Thus their view of the function of government, the religious complexion of the country, and the lessons of past history combined to urge upon them a policy of separation between the civil and the religious sphere. In the Fed-

eral Constitution, their standpoint found expression in the following provisions: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

These constitutional provisions involve no disparagement of religion. They stand simply for freedom of conscience and the equality of different religious communions. Tolerance and neutrality are declared by them to be the policy of the general government in relation to matters of faith and worship. It may be noticed also that in practice this neutrality has not been conserved with rigid exactness. Recognizing that the people, with insignificant exceptions, entertain some form of theistic and Christian faith, the government has responded to the sentiment of the nation at large, by employing chaplains in its congressional assemblies, by providing for religious services in the army and the navy, and by the appointment of days of national thanksgiving and supplication.

The restriction which the general government imposed upon itself, it did not impose upon the States. But naturally the latter gravitated toward the ideal which had commended itself to the framers of the Constitution. Religious establishments had mostly disappeared in the Revolutionary era. Remnants of the old régime remained, however, in Connecticut and Massachusetts. The Congregational order held a privileged position in these States, being entitled to assess rates for the parish church upon others than Congregationalists, at least where the outsiders were not connected

with some other religious society. Connecticut abolished this badge of inequality in 1818; in Massachusetts it was not completely eliminated till 1833. The removal of the last vestige of the old State churches of New England met with some protest. But scarcely was it accomplished before Congregationalists were as heartily reconciled to it as any others. From that time the policy of the States has universally conformed to the model given in the prohibition of a national church establishment. In a large proportion of them a barrier is raised by a constitutional clause or by statute against the appropriation of public funds to the support of sectarian institutions or denominational schools. On the subject of religious tests there is not quite so complete a unanimity as on that of church establishments. While a majority of the State constitutions exclude such tests as a condition of office, six Southern States in the letter of their provisions make those ineligible to office who deny the existence of a Supreme Being; and two States, namely, Pennsylvania and Texas, assume to require, in addition, an assent to the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments.

The immediate conditions under which the experiment of a free church in the United States was set on foot were not altogether favorable. The Revolutionary struggle, if it intensified the sense of dependence upon Divine Providence in some minds, diverted many from religious interests, and acted as a depressing and disrupting force within many congregations. After the achievement of independence the task of organizing the Republic and starting it upon its career was so great and engrossing as to direct thousands of citizens rather

to secular than to churchly enterprise. In order to gain any adequate hearing, religion needed to speak with a potent voice.

To these obstacles another was added, which not a few in that age judged to be still more formidable. The sympathetic relation with France, which had resulted from her alliance with the colonies in their struggle for independence, naturally served as a bridge for the introduction of more or less of the infidelity which was poured forth on the eve, and during the progress, of the French Revolution. The political services which Thomas Paine had rendered to the country were a persuasive with men of light convictions to give the "Age of Reason" a larger consideration than was due to so crude and superficial an assault upon the religion of the Bible. Moreover, there were men in the front rank of statesmanship and official position who were understood to be deeply imbued with the French type of unbelief. This was notably the case with Thomas Jefferson. In the representations of political opponents his creed was pictured as falling little short of atheism. But this was an exaggeration. At the worst, the creed of Jefferson was a deistic type of Unitarianism, which gave little or no place to the idea of positive revelation, allowed a curtailing of the gospel narratives, located the Apostle Paul with dupes and impostors, and admitted the vile image used by Servetus in describing the doctrine of the Trinity. On the other hand, Jefferson kept his more ultra views to himself, or expressed them only in private letters to those who were believed to be in sympathy with his free-thinking; he was cautious about influencing the religious convictions even of those most nearly

related to him ; he approved the object of Bible societies, contributed liberally to their work, and declared that "there never was a more pure and sublime system of morality delivered to man than is to be found in the four evangelists ;" he made for his own use a collection of the sayings of Jesus, and described them as "the most beautiful morsel of morality which has been given to us by man."¹

Thus commended, a species of unbelief, which might be described as French deism, made some progress in the country. Reliable testimony indicates that Virginia was much infected with this type of unbelief, and that it also invaded other regions.² Being imported from abroad, instead of being worked out by personal industry, it did not take very deep root in the majority of its adherents. The spur of a new intellectual fashion, or a desire to find a cover for a practical disregard of religion, was a leading incentive with many, especially among the more youthful representatives of the current

¹ H. S. Randall, Life of Thomas Jefferson ; James Parton, Life of Jefferson ; Theodore Dwight, The Character of Thomas Jefferson as Exhibited in his own Writings.

² Devereux Jarratt wrote in 1796 that infidel books were read with much avidity in Virginia. "They suit the taste of the times, which delights most in *black inspiration*." (Life, by himself, p. 216.) Channing, who was in Virginia between 1798 and 1800, reported : "Infidelity is very general among the higher classes ; and they who do not reject Christianity can hardly be said to believe, as they never examine the foundations on which it rests. In fine, religion is in a deplorable state." William Meade, referring to the circumstances of his ordination in 1811, said : "Infidelity was then rife in the State, and the College of William and Mary was regarded as the hot-bed of French politics and religion. I can truly say that then, and for some years after, in every educated young man of Virginia whom I met, I expected to find a sceptic, if not an avowed unbeliever."

scepticism. The distemper accordingly was found to be in large part within the reach of remedies. Among the undergraduate free-thinkers, who abounded in Yale College near the close of the eighteenth century, the sturdy logic of President Dwight operated effectively for the expulsion of doubt and the introduction of Christian faith. In the less cultured mass unbelief—which here might perhaps be described better as irreligious wildness—was often melted away before the fire of religious revival.

Though subject to criticism, as respects some of their methods and incidents, revivals were doubtless a most potent instrumentality in checking infidelity and promoting vital piety in the nation. The year 1799 seems to have introduced the era of special awakening, though shortly before there had been some tokens of increased sensibility. At that time Kentucky, whose people, as is apt to be the case with pioneer communities, had largely been given to a reckless disregard of religion, was mightily shaken. Zeal, excitement, and curiosity brought the people together in great crowds, so that encampments were necessarily formed, and out-door meetings held. Thus the typical camp-meeting, the first example of which was instituted in 1800, sprang out of a practical exigency. In these sylvan assemblies, wherein Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists co-operated, religious conviction and emotion were diffused as if by a subtle contagion, and often the most obdurate found it impossible to resist. For three or four years the revival ran with full current. Meanwhile an awakening, carried forward by like methods, spread through the Carolinas, and reached into Georgia and Virginia. Both in this region and

in Kentucky remarkable physical effects attended the spiritual crisis. The "falling exercise" was a recurring incident. There were scenes in which men fell as if they had been fired upon from an invisible battery. Other and more eccentric forms of bodily exercise also had place in some districts. But whatever offence came from this source, discreet observers rejoiced in the fact that a multitude of persons put off unrighteousness, and were inducted into a God-fearing temper and habit of life.

A similar visitation, though perhaps attended with less of visible excitement, was experienced in other portions of the country. One hundred and fifty towns in New England, it has been estimated, shared in revival influences between 1797 and 1803.

During the first three decades of the nineteenth century revivals of greater or less extent occurred at frequent intervals. A book published at Albany in 1819 contains reports of about four hundred revivals which had taken place in the four years preceding. In 1830 an awakening began which spread over a great part of the country. "In the course of six months prior to August, 1831, it was estimated that a thousand different congregations in the United States had been visited by the Spirit, and not less than fifty thousand persons had been converted."¹ Nor does this aggregate represent the full harvest, for the revival continued still in much power for a considerable space. Between 1829 and 1832 twenty-seven thousand communicants were added to the Congregationalists alone. Many colleges were visited at this time. Indeed, from the time of the

¹ Punction, History of Congregationalism, v. 502, 503.

revival at Yale in 1802 the colleges were often the theatres of marked religious interest, and thus were enabled to extend far and wide the blessings of a sanctified culture. The record of Amherst is perhaps exceptional; but it was doubtless approximated in some other institutions. Reckoning up to the year 1878 this college had contributed, out of twenty-three hundred and ninety-eight alumni, eight hundred and ninety-seven to the Christian ministry, and ninety-seven to the work of foreign missions.

After a period of comparative dearth — due probably in some degree to a reaction from the unhealthy excitement of the Adventist foolery known as Millerism — a revival national in extent was witnessed in 1857 and 1858. It is computed that the churches received an addition of three hundred thousand members during this season. Between the November of one year and that of the next the Methodist Episcopal Church received not less than one hundred and thirty-six thousand communicants. That the revival spirit has not slumbered in recent times is indicated by the fact that in the decade 1870 to 1880 the membership of the evangelical churches was increased by so large a figure as 3,392,567.¹ A special characteristic of more recent efforts to promote vital religion has been the extent to which the agency of laymen has been employed. Dwight L. Moody and others have shown in a signal manner that an ability effectively to preach the gospel is no monopoly of the ordained.

The relative success of the voluntary principle in the United States is indicated by the rate of increase of

¹ Dorchester, Christianity in the United States, p. 696.

church-membership as compared with that of the population. From 1800 to 1886 the population increased 11.01 fold, the communicants in the Protestant churches 33.3 fold. From 1850 to 1886 the population increased 152 per cent, the communicants 243 per cent.¹ In the census of 1890 Protestant *communicants* were reported as numbering above fourteen millions. To ascertain the number of *adherents* about two and a half times as many more would need to be added.

An eminent English writer, who took the needful care to acquaint himself with this country, has estimated the authority and influence of religion by such tests as the habit of attending church, the sale of religious books, interest in theological questions, and the amount of respect paid to Christian precepts and to ministers. "In all these respects," he says, "the influence of Christianity seems to be, if we look not merely to the numbers but also to the intelligence of the persons influenced, greater and more widespread in the United States than in any part of western Continental Europe, and I think greater than in England. In France, Italy, Spain, and the Catholic parts of Germany, as well as in German Austria, the authority of religion over the masses is of course great. Its influence on the best-educated classes — one must include all parts of society in order to form a fair judgment — is apparently smaller in France and Italy than in Great Britain, and I think distinctly smaller than in the United States. The country which most resembles America in this respect is Scotland, where the mass of the people enjoy large rights in the management of their church affairs, and

¹ Dorchester, p. 750.

where the interest of all classes has, ever since the Reformation, tended to run in ecclesiastical channels. So far from suffering from the want of State support, religion in the United States seems to stand all the firmer because, standing alone, she is seen to stand by her own strength.”¹ The same writer remarks: “In works of active beneficence no country has surpassed, perhaps none has equalled, the United States. Not only are the sums collected for all sorts of philanthropic purposes larger, relatively to the wealth of America, than in any European country, but the amount of personal interest shown in good works and personal effort devoted to them seems to a European visitor to exceed what he knows at home.” His view of the extent to which Biblical lore enters into the intellectual texture of the nation is thus expressed: “A perusal of the literature which the ordinary American of the educated farming and working classes reads, and a study of the kind of literature which those Americans who are least colored by European influences produce, lead me to think that the Bible and Christian theology altogether do more in the way of forming the imaginative back-ground to an average American view of the world and nature than they do in modern Protestant Europe.”

Our amiable critic has given a favorable picture. Still, if it needs to be qualified, it is by reference mainly to the effects of foreign immigration, that is, to facts which do not touch the proper tendency of American institutions. The number of our ecclesiastical subdivisions, it is true, invites adverse comment. But the ground of many of these was prepared in other countries.

¹ James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*, ii. 567, 568.

Moreover, the divisions have often caused but little interruption of Christian activity, and over them all there has been spreading a spirit of mutual appreciation and friendliness. It cannot be denied also that our country has had its list of religious eccentricities. But not a few of these too have been imported. As we receive from the whole world, we cannot properly be required to present a complete model of sobriety until the whole world becomes sober. So far as native growths are concerned, we have not distanced the rest of Christendom in wild products. In the larger communions quite as much of theological steadiness has in general been maintained as in the kindred bodies of Europe. Indeed, the unbiassed observer might be led to question whether a regard for the practical advantages of denominational homogeneity does not incline a large proportion of American Christians to a certain excess of conservatism rather than to the opposite extreme of radicalism.

In the important work of educating the public conscience the Church in the United States has wrought with a fair degree of wholesome energy. It must be confessed, however, that there are some pages in its record which cannot be reviewed with complacency. As the story of slavery is the great American tragedy, illustrating beyond the power of all dramatic art the compromising effect of an evil once tolerated and adopted, so the Church figures in connection with this subject as partly bound, shackled, and compromised in its teaching and action.

The course of the Church in relation to slavery was similar to that of the State. In neither was the voice of

protest silenced ; but in both, as the nineteenth century advanced, it was partly hushed or even turned into apology. For some time after the adoption of the Federal Constitution, slavery was at the most excused. No part of the country took a stronger position. The leading men in the South spoke of the institution as an entailed evil, and not as something to be defended in principle. Even as late as 1831-32, during an animated debate in the Virginia legislature, slavery was characterized by some of the speakers as "the most pernicious of all the evils with which the body politic can be afflicted ;" as "the severest calamity that has ever befallen any portion of the human race," having an "irresistible tendency to undermine and destroy everything like virtue and morality in the community ;" as "a great and appalling evil, a blighting and withering curse upon the land," the "bitterest drop from the chalice of the destroying angel." In Kentucky at a still later date (1849), as a proposition to amend the constitution of the State was before the people, public men did not hesitate to support resolutions against slavery, in which it was described as contrary to the natural rights of mankind, opposed to the fundamental principles of free government, inconsistent with a state of sound morality, and hostile to the prosperity of the commonwealth. But in the South as a whole, language of this sort was already out of date before the close of the fourth decade. Slavery and political ascendency in the national government became associated in the thought of Southern politicians, and more and more the determination was deepened to extend slave territory and to suffer no restriction upon the "peculiar institution."

The principal motive back of the annexation of Texas and the war with Mexico was the purpose to enlarge the area of slavery. The stipulation which Mexico wished to put into the treaty of cession, that slavery should not be permitted in the vast territory relinquished to the United States, could not obtain the slightest hearing. Even the right of Congress to restrict slavery in the territories came to be challenged. The existence of this right was taken for granted by the framers of the Constitution, as appears in the Ordinance of 1787, which excluded slavery from the Northwestern Territory. The assumption of the same right lay at the basis of the Missouri Compromise, which for a generation drew the dividing line between freedom and slavery at the latitude of $36^{\circ} 30'$. But all this interpretation of governmental powers must be cast aside. In 1854 the Missouri Compromise was repealed, and then the doctrine of Calhoun was earnestly pressed, that the national authority is not merely incompetent to prohibit slavery in the territories, but is bound to secure its right of existence there, as against leaving the matter to the option of the inhabitants. As this apparently successful effort to make slavery a distinctive national institution in theory and in practice was progressing, here and there a devotee of the system had the hardihood to advocate the reopening of the African slave trade, which had been outlawed by the United States since 1808. Thus within a space of time no greater than that which separates between early manhood and old age in the life of the individual, a great revolution was wrought in the formal attitude toward slavery. How completely the platform of the fathers of the Republic had been dis-

carded is clearly illustrated in the speech of Alexander H. Stephens, delivered in the spring of 1861 in behalf of the Confederacy of seceding States. Speaking of Jefferson and his compeers, he said : "The prevailing ideas entertained by him and most of the leading statesmen at the time of the formation of the old Constitution were that the enslavement of the African was in violation of the laws of nature; that it was wrong in principle, socially, morally, and politically. It was an evil they knew not well how to deal with; but the general opinion of the men of that day was that somehow or other in the order of Providence the institution would be evanescent and pass away. . . . Those ideas, however, were fundamentally wrong. They rested upon the assumption of the equality of the races. This was an error. It was a sandy foundation; and the idea of a government built upon it,—when the storm came and the wind blew, it fell. Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite ideas; its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests upon the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man,—that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and normal condition."¹

The estimate of slavery which is contained in these utterances had been voiced with increasing volume for the space of a generation, by the lips of theologians, and the Scriptures had been appealed to in confirmation. According to an article in the New Orleans *True Witness* (Aug. 18, 1860), James Smylie, a Presbyterian clergyman, was the first herald in that region of the

¹ Quoted by Wilson, History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America, iii. 122, 123.

doctrine that slavery is sanctioned as a legitimate institution in both the Old and the New Testament. The writer indicates that this view at first found little sympathy, even with the large slaveholders, but in course of time became a commonplace of Southern theology. The most distinguished clergymen of the South blew this note from their gospel trumpets. Thornwell, of South Carolina, spoke as though slavery was too much of a necessity and a benefit to be confined to the black race, asserting that the successful organization of labor could be accomplished only "by converting the laborer into capital; in other words, by slavery." Armstrong of Virginia ventured to suggest that a like settlement of the labor question might yet be discovered by statesmen generally to be the providential way out of difficulties. Some Northern divines also took up the rôle of the apologist, and were ready to contend that the relation between master and slave was just as legitimate as that between ruler and ruled, husband and wife, parent and child, being a divine ordinance for training men in obedience. Samuel Seabury of New York thought that slavery of the Southern type might have existed in Paradise, and may continue through the millennium. So high a flight of an idealizing fancy was, however, quite beyond the capacity of most Northern clergymen. A far more usual procedure was to discountenance agitation as likely to be mischievous and dangerous. Naturally this was not wholly successful. When a system which reduced men to the rank of chattels, and left no guarantee to the family relation, was advancing every hour, the call to silence seemed to the more impetuous spirits infidelity to truth and duty. There was indeed some ground for

the ringing exclamation of William Lloyd Garrison : "The apathy of the people is enough to make every statue leap from its pedestal, and to hasten the resurrection of the dead!"

The tendency to a quiescent attitude, which spread through a considerable section of the nation in the second quarter of the century, was illustrated in the legislation of some of the principal communions, especially of those which were largely represented in the South. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1815 was still committed to its earlier position. It expressed regret at the continuance of African slavery, and spoke of emancipation as something to be kept in view and to be prepared for through the religious education of the slaves. At the Assembly of 1818 a paper was adopted, which indeed took account of the difficulties in which brethren at the South were involved, but nevertheless was most unsparing in its criticism of slavery. It contained such statements as these : "We consider the voluntary enslaving of one portion of the human race by another as a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature, and as utterly inconsistent with the law of God, which requires us to love our neighbor as ourselves, and as totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the gospel of Christ, which enjoins that 'all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.' Slavery creates a paradox in the moral system ; it exhibits rational, accountable, and immortal beings in such circumstances as scarcely to leave them the power of moral action. It exhibits them as dependent on the will of others whether they shall receive religious instruction ; whether they

shall know and worship the true God ; whether they shall enjoy the ordinances of the gospel ; whether they shall perform the duties and cherish the endearments of husbands and wives, parents and children, neighbors and friends ; whether they shall preserve their chastity and purity, or regard the dictates of justice and humanity. Such are some of the consequences of slavery, — consequences not imaginary, but which connect themselves with its very existence.” This was worthy language. It was not destined, however, to be repeated. In 1836 the Assembly, pleading lack of time, and professing incompetency to make laws to bind the conscience, voted that the whole subject of slavery in its relations to the Church should be indefinitely postponed. In 1845 the following very tame declaration was adopted by the Old School Assembly : “ As to the extent of the evils involved in slavery, and the best methods of removing them, various opinions prevail, and neither the Scriptures nor our Constitution authorize this body to prescribe any particular course to be pursued by the churches under our care.” It is true that in the Assembly of 1846 a resolution was accepted which stated that the action of the previous year was not designed to rescind the testimony which had often been uttered prior to that date. But this was by no means equivalent to a specific approval of the strong language of 1818, and probably was allowed to pass as a prudential expedient for quieting agitation. In 1849 the Assembly disclaimed any prerogative to meddle with the question of emancipation.¹

A similar development occurred in the Methodist

¹ See R. L. Stanton, *The Church and the Rebellion.*

Church. For a time the general authorities in that communion seemed to be much more concerned for the abolition of *abolitionism* than for the abolition of slavery. The drift from the earlier position is made very noticeable by a comparison of the action taken in 1800 with that of 1836. At the former date the General Conference passed a regulation which implied that the Methodist Church was to be in perpetuity an emancipation or abolition society, devoted to an active opposition to slavery, until the land should be clear of the evil. "The Annual Conferences," so reads the regulation, "are directed to draw up addresses for the gradual emancipation of the slaves, to the legislatures of those States in which no general laws have been passed for that purpose. These addresses shall urge, in the most respectful but pointed manner, the necessity of a law for the gradual emancipation of the slaves; proper committees shall be appointed by the Annual Conferences, out of the most respectable of our friends, for the conducting of the business; and the presiding-elders, elders, deacons, and travelling preachers, shall procure as many proper signatures as possible to the addresses, and give all the assistance in their power, in every respect, to aid the committees, and to further this blessed undertaking. Let this be continued from year to year till the desired end be accomplished." On the other hand, the General Conference of 1836, held at Cincinnati, learning that two of its members had participated in an anti-slavery meeting, passed by a large majority the following resolutions: "*Resolved*, by the delegates of the Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled: 1. That they disapprove, in the most unqualified sense, the conduct

of the two members of the General Conference who are reported to have lectured in this city recently upon and in favor of modern abolitionism. 2. That they are decidedly opposed to modern abolitionism, and wholly disclaim any right, wish, or intention, to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists in the slaveholding States of the Union." In harmony with the import of these resolutions, the bishops, while presiding over Annual Conferences, in more than one instance refused to entertain anti-slavery resolutions. Yet, at the same time that they were thus rebuking Northern zeal, Southern Conferences were passing resolutions of an opposite tenor. In 1838 the Georgia Conference took this action: "*Resolved*: 1. That it is the sense of the Georgia Annual Conference that slavery, as it exists in the United States, *is not a moral evil*. 2. That we view slavery as a civil and domestic institution, and one with which, as ministers of Christ, we have nothing to do, further than to ameliorate the condition of the slave by endeavoring to impart to him and his master the benign influence of the religion of Christ, and aiding both on their way to heaven. 3. That the Georgia Annual Conference regard with feelings of profound respect and approbation the dignified course pursued by several bishops in suppressing the attempts which have been made by various individuals to get up and protract an excitement in the churches and country on the subject of abolitionism."¹ Resolutions of similar import were adopted by the South Carolina Conference in 1839. At the General Conference of 1840 the reso-

¹ L. C. Matlack, History of American Slavery and Methodism, 1780-1849.

lutions of the Georgia Conference were in effect sanctioned, since that body approved the journal of this Conferencee, though the item on the moral character of slavery was distinctly brought to its attention. At the same General Conference it was voted to be "inexpedient and unjustifiable" to admit colored witnesses in church trials against white persons, in any State which denied to that class — of course in the secular courts — the privilege of testifying. Doubtless the real amount of tolerant feeling toward slavery was not as large as this series of actions at first sight would indicate. Much of the endeavor to silence agitation was dictated by the fear of disruption. The call to quietude was honestly regarded as the demand of practical wisdom and Christian duty, though in reality it was much like voting that slavery should be everlasting, unless God should miraculously interpose for its overthrow. The immediate design, too, of this peace policy was utterly and speedily frustrated. The disruption came at the General Conference of 1844, where it was found impossible to evade the difficulties involved in the fact that Bishop Andrew had come into the possession of slaves. Anti-slavery sentiment had reached too high a pitch, especially in New England, to make it tolerable to the Northern Conferences to be presided over by a slaveholding bishop. The fact that in 1842 Orange Scott, La Roy Sunderland, and other zealous anti-slavery men had withdrawn and embodied their protest against the course of the Methodist Episcopal Church in a new branch of Methodism, which, under the name of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection, numbered at the end of two years about fifteen thousand members, properly sharpened their apprehen-

sion as to the results of any further tribute to slavery. The Southern ministers, on their part, deemed that, if they should sanction the request that Bishop Andrew should refrain from episcopal functions so long as he should be an owner of slaves, their position and prospects would be seriously shadowed, since they might be expected to be disowned to a large extent by their own people. It was only left therefore to part company,—a prophecy of the separating wall which desperate hands ere long would attempt to raise, in blood and sorrow, across the national domain.

Other communions also spoke with divided voice. An eminent Congregationalist clergyman declared, in the review which he edited, that “abolitionists are justly liable to the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censure.” In practical accord with this utterance, a freedom of speech was conceded to the cause of slavery which was denied to that of human liberty. This was at least true in many Northern communities between 1834 and 1842, when the person and property of anti-slavery agitators were often subjected to mob violence.

The extent to which the Church stood in their way or directly opposed their efforts ere long embittered a part of the abolitionists, insomuch that they began to think of the Church in general as the enemy of reform. Garrison and those associated with him gave utterance to bitter denunciations. Some in more recent times have sympathized with their sweeping criticism. But two qualifying facts should be observed. On the one hand, abolitionists were not always blessed with discretion, and in some instances fairly earned a share of the opposition which they experienced by their intemperate

language and ultra maxims. On the other hand, the Church, in whatever degree it may have been the advocate of inaction, at the same time was a main source of the conscience and conviction which kept up the agitation. "It has been fashionable," says Senator Wilson, "to couple the charge of infidelity with the mention of the abolition effort. Nothing could be more unjust or untrue. Anti-slavery was the child of Christian faith. Its early and persistent defenders and supporters were men who feared God and called upon his name. Till the year 1836 and 1837 there was not a shadow of excuse for such an imputation. Up to that time Mr. Garrison himself was depending and calling upon the churches and ministers for help; and it was not until he had been engaged nearly ten years, and had received rebuffs and bitter opposition, instead of encouragement and help, from both parties and sects, that he and his immediate followers adopted the policy they afterward pursued. But they never constituted more than a fraction of the anti-slavery host. The veteran William Goodell estimated their number at about one eighth. The large majority of abolitionists retained their connection with both the ecclesiastical and political organizations of the land. . . . The Protestant clergy and the membership of the Protestant churches in the free States aided, with few exceptions, in the election of Mr. Lincoln, gave large and generous support to his administration, earnestly demanded and vigorously sustained his policy of emancipation."¹

¹ Slave Power, iii 718-723. It may be noticed that Garrison in his vocation as an anti-slavery agitator was distinctly under obligation to the Christian Church. The Quakers as a communion inculcated anti-slavery

Custom has sanctioned the statement that the war of the Rebellion gave the death-blow to slavery. The statement, however, is but partly true. Human insight indeed cannot see how anything short of the terrible surgery of the sword could have sundered the evil from the body politic. Still, the effective causes of the downfall of slavery lay farther back : in the persistent protests of the Quakers ; in the untiring labors of Wilberforce ; in Wesley's terse denunciations of the traffic in human flesh ; in the sober reflection of the Revolutionary statesmen, which made them see that a system of bondage was an utter anomaly in a republic dedicated to freedom ; in the long line of earnest men whom neither threats nor persuasions could seduce into a surrender of principle to the claims of expediency. Without these causes either the emancipation proclamation of President Lincoln would not have been issued, or being issued would not have been adequately sustained by a firm and resolute public opinion.

In the temperance reform in the United States the Church has undoubtedly been the citadel where the main strength and inspiration have been lodged. A number of sermons, in the early part of the century, from such men as Ebenezer Porter, Lyman Beecher, Heman Humphrey, and Nathaniel S. Prime were a means of awakening conscience over the scandal and ruin of the drinking habits which were then fearfully prevalent. Action taken by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in 1811, gave an impulse to the foundation of temperance societies. These at first doctrine. Garrison received the initial incentive to his reforming activity from the Quaker Benjamin Lundy.

did not take the high ground of total abstinence; but experience ere long taught that nothing less could be effectual in the warfare against appetite.

A new advance in the reform was accomplished in 1840, as the Washingtonian movement swept like a wave of humanitarian zeal over the country. By the efforts of this era it is supposed that six hundred thousand men were redeemed from alcoholic slavery. But the open saloon was too great an ordeal to the enfeebled will of a majority of them. More than two thirds fell again under the old tyranny. This appalling sacrifice of manhood and defeat of generous effort very naturally aroused serious questioning over the propriety of tolerating such death-traps as the saloons. We find, accordingly, that between 1850 and 1856 prohibitory laws were adopted in a dozen States.

From this plane there was a very noticeable descent in the ensuing years. An overweening confidence in the efficacy of mere enactments, the demoralizing influences of a protracted civil war, the incoming of crowds of emigrants who had received no training in temperance principles, the fallacy that beer-drinking or wine-drinking might set the fiery liquors aside instead of educating a taste for them, and the desperate energy of mammon and depraved appetite to secure their fill,—prepared for a partial apostasy from the position which had been gained in the middle of the century. The statute-books in many of the prohibitory States were revised in favor of license, and the amount of liquor consumed gave evidence of a perilous drift in the habits of the people. Still, the friends of temperance have not lost courage, and find not a few reasons for

hopefulness. By the operation of local option much territory has been placed under a prohibitory policy. Medical theory has become increasingly favorable to abstinence from intoxicants. The power of early education is being utilized as never before for the inculcation of a wholesome fear and detestation of the drink plague. While sluggishness and flabbiness are manifest in a part of the ecclesiastical area, it is still true that some of the leading Protestant communions are in spirit and practice total-abstinence societies. In the Roman Catholic Church total-abstinence societies have made a gratifying progress since their initiation in 1870, and afford thus a measure of relief to the minds of zealous friends of temperance in that communion, who have deplored the fact that so large a part of the liquor traffic is in the hands of men whose baptism and religious training were received in the Roman Catholic Church.¹

Like other great communities, the people of the United States can doubtless find as many occasions for humiliation as for boasting. Nevertheless, the religious history and present condition of the nation abundantly prove that a church unsupported and untrammelled by connection with the State can be, relatively speaking, an efficient guardian of the interests of Christian piety and morality.

¹ See Dorchester, *Liquor Problem in all Ages*; also, *Christianity in the United States*.

II.—DENOMINATIONAL MOVEMENTS AND CRISES IN THE UNITED STATES.

1. UNITARIANS AND UNIVERSALISTS.—In the first years of the nineteenth century a strange branch appeared upon the old Puritan trunk in eastern Massachusetts. Out of the bosom of Congregational orthodoxy Unitarianism emerged, and with so much freshness and vigor that it threatened for a season to overshadow the parent stock. In Boston the Old South Church alone kept the primitive New England faith, and bore a solitary banner till the founding of Park Street Church in 1809 provided her with a stanch confederate.

The rise of New England Unitarianism was due very largely to native causes. Doubtless the movement in England which in the course of the eighteenth century transformed the Presbyterian into a predominantly Unitarian body exerted a measure of influence on this side of the Atlantic. But the English coefficient was probably a less factor in the result than the developments which occurred in the Puritan communities themselves. The half-way covenant operated to bring into the churches many to whom the Calvinistic theology was too strong a diet for easy digestion,—to whom indeed any form of aggressive piety was scarcely congenial. In proportion as men of this class failed to catch the enthusiasms of the Great Awakening, in which stern doctrines were preached with tremendous force, they naturally were confirmed and strengthened by that profound agitation in their dislike of Calvinistic orthodoxy. For a time this alienation wrought mainly in a negative way.

There was an ill-defined revolt against the inherited creed. Many who felt that the old faith was one-sided and intolerable were not clear as to the precise substitute which ought to be introduced in its place. For a generation or more there was a hazy drift, gathering an increasing company as it proceeded, and now and then casting up an individual into open heterodoxy. About 1757-59 some clergymen began to speak and write against the propriety of imposing creeds of human composition. In 1768 Hopkins, of Newport, Rhode Island, alleged in a sermon that the doctrine of Christ's divinity was much neglected, if not disbelieved, in Boston. In 1789 Freeman, who had been ordained, two years before, over the King's Chapel society, as one that had eliminated the doctrine of the Trinity from its prayer-book, notified Belsham that there were then many churches in New England whose worship was strictly Unitarian. Leonard Worcester testified in 1795 that "Socinianism or Arianism had very extensively, if not very generally, taken the place of Arminianism" in New England. So undisguised was the Unitarianism of Kendall, who was ordained over the First Congregational Church of Plymouth in 1800, that nearly half of the members seceded after listening to his preaching for a few months. In 1805 the installation of Henry Ware as Divinity Professor in Harvard College indicated that the "liberal theology" had won the ascendancy in the corporation of that institution. In 1812 a correspondent of Belsham informed him that, while in Boston King's Chapel alone was professedly Unitarian, the major part of the clergy and the respectable laity was in reality of the same cast. Three years later this statement was

abundantly verified, as the publication of extracts from the memoirs of Lindsey — under the title of "American Unitarianism, or a Brief History of the Progress and Present State of the Unitarian Churches in America" — stirred up an amount of inquiry and controversy which necessarily brought out the real facts of the case. In this controversy the principal disputants were William Ellery Channing and Samuel Worcester. A sermon delivered by the former in Baltimore in 1819 served as one of the most distinct manifestoes of the Unitarian party, and drew forth a response from Moses Stuart. With Channing, Professor Andrews Norton was active in giving the doctrinal standard to the first generation of confessed Unitarians. The formation in 1825 of the American Unitarian Association supplied the new body with a means of united effort and a standing agency for propagandism. Much Unitarian literature was thereby disseminated, but only moderate energy has been displayed in the organization of churches. At the coming of the last decade of the century a maximum of four hundred societies had not yet been reached.¹

In the history of American Unitarianism three eras may be distinguished, as respects the types of religious convictions and tendencies which have come to the surface. The first of these may be regarded as extending into the fourth decade of the century, and as finding in Channing its most potent representative. Here we find an acknowledgment of religious experience, viewed as the result of a special divine agency in the hearts of men. We notice also a definite stress upon the

¹ On this summary compare Punchard, *History of Congregationalism*, vol. v.

objective foundation of religion, a resolute assertion of the importance of written revelation, at least within the limits of the New Testament. We observe still further a tendency to recognize a superhuman dignity in Christ, and to allow that, beyond the mere declaration of the truth, his work had some positive, though not easily defined, connection with the forgiveness of human sin.

On each of these points the writings of Channing afford unequivocal illustrations. Some of his references to religious experience have an infusion of Wesleyan warmth. Shortly before his induction into the ministry he wrote : "All my sentiments and affections have lately changed. I once considered mere moral attainments as the only object I had to pursue. I have now solemnly given myself up to God. I consider supreme love to Him as the first of all duties, and morality seems but a branch from the vigorous root of religion." Some years later he affirmed : "A change of heart is the object of the gospel. In this consists the redemption of Christ."

"The Spirit of God operates on the heart, creates new exercises, and dwells in the soul of Christians by constantly and immediately supporting all good affections. Every man must be new-born, have a new heart, a new principle, end, motive, disposition, a change by the Spirit into a meek, submissive, self-renouncing, self-abhorring, benevolent state of soul, before he can believe, approve, choose the gospel, and receive the kingdom of heaven."

Channing had a firm faith in the Gospel narratives, with their impress of the supernatural. We find him in his later years penning such sentences as these : "To

me the history of Christianity in the Gospels is inestimable. The life, spirit, works, and character of Jesus Christ are to me the brightest revelations of his truth. I know no histories to be compared with the Gospels in marks of truth, in pregnancy of meaning, in quickening power. I attach great importance to the miracles. They have a vital union with the religion, are full of it, and marvellously adapted to it. They are not anomalous, arbitrary events. I have no faith in abstract, insulated, purposeless miracles, which indeed are morally impossible; but the miracles of Christ belong to him, complete the manifestation of him, are in harmony with his truth, and at once give to it, and receive from it confirmation. . . . Without the divine excellence of Christ, the testimony of the miracles would not satisfy us. This is the grand foundation and object of faith. Still, the miracles do not cease to be important, for they are among the brightest manifestations of his character."

In his view of Christ's person, Channing to the last seems to have transcended the humanitarian position. If he is not to be styled an Arian, it is because that term is indicative of a more precise definition than he was willing to formulate. In 1810 he wrote: "Jesus Christ is the Son of God in a peculiar sense, the temple of the Divinity, the brightest image of His glory. In seeing him we see the Father." The following sentences, written in 1815, express in more definite terms a like conception: "We agreed in our late conference that a majority of our brethren believe that Jesus Christ is more than man, that he existed before the world, that he literally came from heaven to save our race, that he sustains other offices than those of teacher and witness

to the truth, and that he still acts for our benefit, and is our intercessor with the Father." In 1831 he wrote : "I am not shocked, as many are, by the humanitarian system. Still, it seems to me to labor under serious objections ; nor am I at all influenced by the argument which its disciples insist upon so earnestly, that it brings Jesus nearer to us. His moral perfection seems to me his great peculiarity and separation from all human beings, and this remains the same on all systems, and is more inexplicable on the humanitarian system than on any other." An expression used in 1841, the year before his death, indicates at once small liking for the humanitarian scheme and small sympathy with an assertory dogmatism on the side of any of the theories in debate. "I am little of a Unitarian," he said, "have little sympathy with the system of Priestley and Bellscham, and stand aloof from all but those who strive and pray for clearer light, who look for a purer and more effectual manifestation of Christian truth."

In his later years Channing was quite as much philanthropist as preacher, and gave large attention to social problems. Throughout his course he entertained a high view of the intrinsic greatness of man and his capacity for progress. He said himself that this was the central and unifying thought of his ministry. In conformity with this standpoint he conceived that the way to reach men effectually was by appeals addressed to the latent nobility of their natures. "Nothing," he said, "will be done by the minister till he arouses in men a fervent energy of the moral principle. Decency, prudence, self-interest, regard to comfort, respectability, are nothing. Men must be made to thirst for perfect goodness, to see

its eternal beauty, to long for it with the full force of their spiritual affections.”¹

Before the death of Channing the humanitarian view, in which Christ is represented as being essentially only the foremost specimen of manhood, had made large advances. This feature, together with the rise and progress of transcendentalism, was characteristic of the second era of New England Unitarianism.

Transcendentalism, as described by its historian,² was more of a gospel than a philosophy,—that is, rather a warmly colored expression of earnest convictions than a painstaking and systematic elaboration of thought. To use another description, it was an “intellectual, æsthetic, and spiritual ferment, not a strictly reasoned doctrine. It was a renaissance of conscious, living faith in the power of reason, in the reality of spiritual insight, in the privilege, beauty, and glory of life.”³ In its religious scheme external authority was reduced to a minimum, and the subjective test — the instincts and intuitions of the human spirit — was made the great criterion of truth.

The writers of this school were indebted to outside sources, but in general drew from them in a somewhat easy fashion, caring more to gain suggestions from their oracles than to follow them in the way of industrious discipleship. “Nine tenths of the early Transcendentalists rubbed but lightly against Plato, Plotinus, Saadi,

¹ An excellent mirror of Channing’s thinking is given in his *Life* by W. H. Channing; and it is from this work that the quotations used have been selected.

² O. B. Frothingham, *Transcendentalism in New England*, 1876.

³ Francis Tiffany, in *Lectures on the Origin and History of Unitarianism*, 1888-89.

Firdusi, Kant, Fichte, Goethe, Schleiermacher, Schelling. . . . For better or worse, Mr. Alcott had got hold of Plotinus, Margaret Fuller of Plato and the Greek legends, Dr. Hedge of Kant and Fichte, Emerson of the Hindu and Persian mystics, Mr. Dwight of Goethe and Beethoven, Mr. Ripley of Schleiermacher and, later on, of the works of the great French socialistic writers, Theodore Parker of De Wette, James Freeman Clarke and others of the ethics of Jouffroy and the writings of Cousin.”¹

The central luminary of New England Transcendentalism was undoubtedly Ralph Waldo Emerson. It is true that Theodore Parker, who mingled with transcendentalism much of the spirit of an iconoclast, was a conspicuous figure for a couple of decades. But his power lay largely in the vehemence and cogency of his spoken words. His writings, besides being disfigured here and there by sentences that grate harshly on Christian sensibility, are far from possessing in general that subtle charm which solicits the glance to the pages of Emerson. However, in his religious scheme he differed little from the Concord sage, except that he used language more distinctly theistic, and asserted with more positiveness the belief in immortality. As respects the historical position of Christ, he thought of him as greater than all predecessors or successors; but he was still inclined to forecast a time when the New Testament would become practically obsolete. Religion in its essentials, as he conceived, is furnished with such plain credentials in the human spirit, that it has little or no need of external supports.

¹ Tiffany, in *Lectures on the Origin and History of Unitarianism*.

The theological position of Emerson was largely determined by his dread of seeing the divine cornered. He was jealous of the ordinary conception of special revelation, as clouding over the truth that revelation is always and everywhere. He disliked to have a definite list of events marked off from other occurrences as being supernatural, and wanted no miracle which "is not one with the blowing clover and the falling rain." To reach the divine, he maintained, there is no bridge to be crossed. The divine is immanent and all-pervasive in relation both to man and nature. "Man is conscious," he says, "of a universal soul within or behind his individual life, wherein, as in a firmanent, the natures of justice, truth, love, freedom, arise and shine." "As there is no screen or ceiling between our heads and the infinite heavens, so is there no bar or wall in the soul where man, the effect, ceases, and God, the cause, begins. The walls are taken away. We lie open on one side to the deeps of spiritual nature, to the attributes of God." "Ineffable is the union of man and God in every act of the soul. The simplest person, who in his integrity worships God, becomes God; yet forever and ever the influx of this better and universal self is new and unsearchable." "When the eye of reason opens, to outline and surface are at once added grace and expression. These proceed from imagination and affection, and abate somewhat of the angular distinctness of objects. If the reason be stimulated to more earnest vision, outlines and surfaces become transparent, and are no longer seen; causes and spirits are seen through them. The best moments of life are those delicious awakenings of the higher powers, and the reverential withdrawing of nature before its God."

In pressing his vivid conception of the divine immanence and inworking, Emerson did not shun expressions that have the sound of pantheism and fatalism. Still, he had no design to leave the ground to either of these, so far as to excuse any relaxation of the stern sense of duty. A strain of Puritan rigor blends with his Greek æstheticism, and he can find no words too strong for asserting the supremacy of the ethical interest above all others. "We are made," he says, "of the moral sentiment, the world is built by it, things endure as they share it; all beauty, all intelligence, all health exist by it." "The final solution, in which scepticism is lost, is in the moral sentiment, which never forfeits its supremacy. All moods may be safely tried, and their weight allowed to all objections; the moral sentiment as easily outweighs them all as any one. This is the drop which balances the sea." "Whilst a man seeks good ends, he is strong by the whole strength of nature. In so far as he roves from these ends he bereaves himself of power or auxiliaries; his being shrinks out of all remote channels, he becomes less and less, a mote, a point, until absolute badness is absolute death."

In Emerson's scheme the absolute badness which he mentions in this connection had a place only by way of hypothesis. His optimistic temper refused to tolerate its possibility. "That pure malignity can exist," he affirmed, "is the extreme proposition of unbelief. It is not to be entertained by a rational agent." In general he sought the sunlight, and had very little inclination to visit the sombre hemisphere. To gain a due impression of the appalling might of evil, and of the anguished wrestling with principalities and powers which is likely to precede victory, one must look elsewhere than to his

pages. Emerson was the prophet of serene confidence. Like many of the mystical writers he is a good companion for a meditative hour. But when it comes to organizing moral effort and securing a firm platform for united action, no system which makes so little account as does his of institutions and of the objective facts of religious history will be able to meet the demand.

The subjectivity and vagueness of transcendentalism were regarded by some Unitarians as not affording an adequate basis for effective church work. Accordingly, in the third era, which may perhaps be dated from the organization of a National Conference in 1865, earnest voices began to emphasize the utility of organization, and of institutions and forms which may satisfy and promote the sense of historic continuity. Henry W. Bellows was an eminent representative of this point of view, and urged it in such words as these: "If Liberal Christianity in her new methods breaks down the regular traditional church institutions and substitutes other ways, believe me, it will not be a progress but a revolution, and a backward one at that. What we need, and what will be a great and glorious success, is to hold fast the precious vessels which ages of divine guidance and religious experience have handed down to us, the great bequest of the Church, while we fill them with the liberty of thought and the freshness of spirit which God has bestowed upon this latter day. If we cannot organize our liberal theology into ecclesiastical shapes, if we cannot maintain the universal rites of the Christian Church, then the religious instincts of the Christian world will repudiate us, and rightly so, and the Holy Spirit will find some new body to occupy our room."

Exhortations like this may have had some effect, but certainly Unitarianism has not made a rapid advance toward the goal which was thus placed in view. Its nature rebels against any firm ecclesiasticism, and in particular spurns the restrictions of creed. The Free Religious Association, which originated in 1867, was mainly an expression of the hostility which was felt in the younger generation of Unitarians against all bonds of a positive theology. More recently the Western Conference took action which implied that the Unitarian Church is an ethical club, without so much as a declared theistic basis. But it may be presumed that this dogmatic swoon was local and temporary. Charity forbids that such complete inanition should be attributed to the Unitarian communion as a whole. It is true, however, that Unitarian writers often speak in a way which indicates very slight anchorage in historical Christianity. The reputation of the body has suffered from the unscientific haste of some of its representatives to surrender to the latest conjectures advanced in the name of science.

In the realm of polite literature American Unitarianism has been favored with a noble list of men of national and international reputation. Among writers on theological themes, James Freeman Clarke and F. H. Hedge are properly assigned an eminent place.

While Unitarianism was advancing to a control of a part of the Congregational communion, it was gaining substantially the whole of the Universalist body. Hosea Ballou, in his "Treatise on the Atonement," published in 1805, sharply criticised the doctrine of the Trinity. Within a dozen years from this time the number of

Trinitarians in the Universalist ministry had been reduced to two,— Dean of Boston, and Mitchell of New York.¹

The ability of Ballou as a propagandist was manifested in another direction. Before he undertook, in 1817, the advocacy of the doctrine that there is no punishment or suffering in the future life, it had obtained little currency. But with his support it advanced to a relative ascendancy. Some of the ministers indeed resisted this serious departure from the original position of the denomination. So greatly were they afflicted by the innovation that in 1831 they formed a distinct organization, styled the Association of Universal Restorationists. In their announcement they declared their belief in future rewards and punishments, to be followed by the final restoration of all mankind to holiness and happiness. The schismatic movement, which at its height included about thirty ministers, chiefly from Massachusetts and Rhode Island, had little success, so far as visible fortunes were concerned. Its creed, however, came off victorious. Before the middle of the century the tide had turned in its favor. In more recent times the great majority of Universalists have allowed that temporary chastisements or sufferings may be devolved upon men in the world to come by the sin and perversity of the present life.

In return for a Unitarian faith the Universalists have given back their restorationist creed. At any rate the latter prevails very largely among Unitarians. This makes an appearance of essential identity of belief on the part of the two bodies. Nevertheless, there has

¹ Eddy, *Universalism in America*, ii. 104.

been a difference in animus, and to some extent in pronounced position. The Universalists have been more united and steady in their acceptance of Biblical authority. Their recent historian says: "German Rationalism, which has made such havoc in the ranks of so-called Liberal Christians, sought a foothold in the Universalist Church, and for a few years, dating from about 1843, fascinated some of the younger preachers, necessitating an examination and expression of opinion by our ecclesiastical councils, which was thorough, emphatic, decisive. The seal of denominational disapprobation was put upon all attempts to eliminate the supernatural from the Christian records, and an earnest and unambiguous deliverance was made that the Universalist Church bows to the Lordship of Jesus Christ and accepts his religion as a revelation from God."¹

2. CONGREGATIONALISTS.—The revivals which occurred in the early part of the nineteenth century gave to the Congregationalists a partial compensation for the Unitarian defection. In Boston the revival movement began about 1823. Three years later it received a fresh impulse from the coming of one of the most effective preachers of that age. With the courage of the born warrior Lyman Beecher united an intense practical zeal. While he was ready to declare with boldness his theological convictions, he had no use for controversy except as it might bring men to the life of piety and saving faith. In his sermons logic always shaped itself sooner or later into persuasion, and persuasion was sent home with that force which can come alone from a powerful

¹ Eddy, ii. 482.

and earnest personality. Dr. Bacon says that whether speaking to a congregation or talking with a company of his brother ministers, "he was like a powerful magnetic battery." The ministry of Lyman Beecher in Boston fell between 1826 and 1832. At the latter date he entered upon a theological professorship at Lane Seminary in Ohio.

Congregationalism was carried westward by emigration from New England and by the activity of missionary societies. In this missionary enterprise Connecticut took a foremost part. The General Association of that State organized itself in 1798 into the Connecticut Missionary Society, and in the following years supported numerous laborers in New York, Western Pennsylvania, and Ohio. As these regions were cultivated also by the Presbyterian Church, and moreover Connecticut Congregationalism was somewhat tolerant of the Presbyterian polity, it naturally came about that a scheme of co-operation in religious work was introduced. In 1801 by agreement between the Association of Connecticut and the Presbyterian General Assembly the so-called "Plan of Union" was established. The tenor of its provisions may be seen in the following description by a friendly pen: "It enjoined on all the missionaries of both parties the promotion of mutual forbearance and accommodation between the two sects. It recommended, in case of minister and people belonging to different sects, that all should maintain their respective forms of government and discipline, and preserve their ecclesiastical connection, settling their difficulties between minister and people by a sort of arbitration, or council, composed of half of each sect, unless all could agree to submit to

the forms of the sect to which the minister should belong. In case of a mixture of Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the same settlement, it recommended their uniting in one church, administering discipline by a committee from the communicants, with a right of appeal to the Presbytery, or the Church, as the accused should be of one or the other sect.”¹

For the space of a generation the Plan of Union was operated with a success which indicates that denominational jealousy was kept within moderate bounds. But it was intrinsically a delicate task so to manage the mixed polity as to give satisfaction to both parties. Congregationalist historians are decidedly of the conviction that the plan was an effective means for turning Congregational into Presbyterian churches, and for installing presbyteries and synods in the place of associations. Presbyterian critics, on the other hand, have charged against the Plan of Union that, in opening the door to Congregationalists, it gave entrance to a lax theology, thus corrupting the pure inheritance which had been handed down by the fathers of the Westminster Assembly. This dogmatic grievance was undoubtedly a main factor in stirring up the hostility of conservative Presbyterians, and constraining them in 1837 to abolish the Plan of Union.

The phase of New England theology which especially provoked disquiet and resentment among the champions of Presbyterian orthodoxy was that which had its seat in New Haven, and its leading representative in N. W. Taylor, of the Yale Theological School. Taylor repre-

¹ Review of the Leading Measures of the General Assembly of 1837 by a member of the New York Bar.

sented the maximum of approach to the Arminian standpoint among the Congregationalist theologians of his day. He departed from the Edwardean notion of divine sovereignty as championed by Hopkins, Emmons, and others, maintaining that there is no ground for assuming that God could prevent all sin while creating free moral agents. He also taught, though not abandoning the doctrine of electing grace, that the power of contrary choice is an essential endowment of a free and responsible being. His view of original sin was likewise a departure from old-school theory, since it allowed no place for hereditary guilt, but only for hereditary corruption, which does not become a ground of guilt till it is appropriated by the personal will.

While New England theologians had quite generally too large an element of independence and inquisitiveness to be very closely tied to old standards, many of them thought that Taylor was sliding away from Calvinian orthodoxy to an unpardonable distance. At the Andover Seminary, which had been opened in 1808 to compensate for the lapse of Harvard University to Unitarian heterodoxy, some of the professors were inclined to raise an opposing banner. But the most conspicuous protest was given in the shape of a new and rival seminary, founded at East Windsor, Conn., in 1833. Here Bennet Tyler and others endeavored to fulfil the part of faithful witnesses. The New Haven theology, however, was not driven from the field. While some of its specific phases may not have claimed permanent regard, in its general tenor it has won a large place in the Congregational body.

The New Haven theology was reproduced in good

part at Oberlin College, which was founded in 1834. But the scheme of the Western institution had its own peculiarities. Charles G. Finney, who was a leading factor in Oberlin theology for thirty years, attracted attention and provoked comment more especially by his advocacy of "the simplicity of moral action" and by his doctrine of Christian perfection. The former item was not altogether exceptional in the Congregational body, being essentially identical with the "exercise theory" of Emmons, namely, the theory that virtue lies wholly in the act of the will, and that this at any given time is wholly good or wholly sinful. By adding to this view the conclusion that the Scriptures warrant belief in the possibility of attaining in this life to fixity in holy choices, Finney reached his more novel doctrine of Christian perfection, or entire sanctification. These terms, in his use of them, meant entire and continuous obedience to the law of God, full accord with the divine standard which applies to man as the subject of a redemptive economy. With Finney the doctrine was mainly a deduction from Biblical data. He made no profession himself of having attained to the ideal which he declared to be possible. As his doctrine was shared, at least in its main feature, by President Mahan and Professor Cowles, it was properly regarded as distinctive of the Oberlin school; elsewhere it received for the most part a cold welcome. The American Board was inclined to regard Oberlin perfectionism as disqualifying candidates for missionary appointments.

The eminence of Finney as a theological thinker may be called in question; but his unique power as a revival preacher admits of only one opinion. Converted at the

age of thirty, and driven from his law office by his passion for souls, he became forthwith the instrument of remarkable awakenings. For a dozen years preceding his call to Oberlin (1835) he was occupied as an evangelist and at intervals after that time fulfilled the same vocation. Even at Oberlin he was quite as much the revival preacher as the teacher, and sent his influence far out over the country by infusing a love of vital piety into a multitude of young people. In looking for the qualities which gave such great effect to his preaching we are led to take special notice of his simplicity of aim and directness of address. His hearers were made to feel, not that they were witnessing a sermonic performance, but that they were receiving a real message, an earnest call then and there to surrender heart and life to the truth. The ordinary strain of his discourse was conversational, but his style rose now and then above this level into dramatic life and intensity. Professor Park says of the sermon which he preached at Andover in 1831 : "It abounded with sterling argument and with startling transitions. It was too earnest to be called theatrical, but in the best sense of the word it was called dramatic." Referring to a discourse delivered by Finney in the same year, at Park street, Boston, Edward Beecher wrote recently : "No one can form any conception of the power of his appeal. It rings in my ears even to this day." Dr. Campbell, who heard him for several months in London, thus describes Finney's manner : "He speaks with an ease altogether peculiar; to a large extent his style is colloquial, interspersed nevertheless with lofty flights and impetuous bursts of a more oratorical character, when the delivery becomes

intense, the voice acquires an ocean swell, accompanied by very energetic action. But these bursts are never long continued ; he quickly returns to an easy level, and for many minutes together proceeds in a state of earnest repose, during which the address is colloquial, but still with a measure of inflection, always forcible and always solemn.”¹

In the middle years of the century a local disturbance was caused by a book from the pen of Horace Bushnell, who began his pulpit career in Hartford in 1833. The offending volume was the treatise entitled “God in Christ.” Some of his Connecticut brethren were much distressed in mind, and pressed industriously for a censure. Happily they were not able to command the needed majority ; for undoubtedly Bushnell was not so far gone in heresy as they imagined. “They fear,” he said to the General Association, “that I am about to grow out a pair of horns, or become a Unitarian. Let me say, for your comfort, that I have not the slightest tendency that way. I hold the fall and depravity of man with a deeper meaning probably than most of you, and believe as much the absolute necessity of his renewal by the Holy Spirit. The Atonement and the Trinity are as dear to me as they are to any.”

The writings of Bushnell form a group by themselves in theological literature. They were no copies, and were not made to be copied. He had no taste for compilation, and in his reading sought for little else than suggestion and impulse. As has been remarked by an appreciative critic : “He worked on his own line and with an eye to what lay around him. Perhaps if he had

¹ Quoted in Life of Finney by G. W. Wright.

been more of a plodder, and had taken time to make himself familiar with other men's thoughts, he might have saved himself some trouble. But it was easier for him to create than to absorb; he was a composer and not a reader, a fountain and not a cistern. Few men ever enjoyed the art of mental creation more thoroughly.”¹

In oratorical faculty Bushnell may have yielded the palm to some of his brethren. He had not the extempore gift, the platform versatility, the rhetorical swing, and the physical cogency of Henry Ward Beecher. In ability to construct a massive and finished oration he was not the superior, possibly not the equal, of R. H. Storrs. But when one looks to his total contribution, it is not easy to select from the list of Congregational pastors those who have left him in the shadow. The freshness, impress of originality, reach of thought, and depth of spiritual sentiment which characterize his writings, arm them with a special vitality and potency. In the theological literature of this country, there are not many monographs as rich or deserving of appreciation as Bushnell's “Nature and the Supernatural.”

A token of dogmatic amelioration appeared in the creed of 1884, published as a summary of the doctrines generally accepted in the Congregationalist churches. It is entirely agreeable to an evangelical Arminian. This does not import that all Congregationalists have renounced the special tenets of Calvinism, but it is an indication that those tenets are not reckoned by them among essentials.

¹ Thomas M. Clark, Bishop of Rhode Island, in *Life and Letters of Bushnell*.

The same year that the creed was brought out, the publication of the first numbers of the Andover Review gave expression to a scheme of theological thought which had won the ascendancy in the Andover Seminary. The most distinctive feature of this scheme lay in the sphere of eschatology. The Andover professors, deeming that Christianity is the absolute religion and Christ the universal judge, and maintaining moreover that the essential fact of Christianity, or the revelation of God in Christ, has unique virtue as a motive power, claimed that consistency requires that all men should be judged on the basis of a Christian probation. As many men, especially the great masses of the heathen world, have no such probation in this life, they drew the conclusion that Christ is presented to them in the life to come, so that all advance to the final judgment as those who have either accepted or rejected the crowning exhibition of God's love in the gift of His Son. The theory as set forth by its advocates is not the theory of a second probation, but of one common probation for all the race, a probation under conditions which alone are adequate to prepare men for the kingdom of heaven. It is not indeed denied that a favored few among the heathen, in following the light of reason and conscience, may have attained to such affinity with things holy and divine as properly to be accounted regenerate. But the vast majority, it is asserted, give no satisfactory indication of this attainment, so that there is adequate ground in reason and justice why they should experience, as a preliminary to final judgment, the salutary force of Christian motives.

Many regarded this teaching, on its first promulgation,

as a letting down of the bars, an opening into the limbo of Universalism ; and charges to that effect were freely vented. That the charges were much too broad is apparent enough to the judicial investigator. The Andover professors did not undertake any more closely than their opponents to determine the number of the saved. To the latter, for the most part, no less than to the former, the notion was intolerable that a majority of the race are doomed to eternal perdition. The two parties therefore differed in this, that for a certain class the one extended the time of trial, while for the same class the other lowered the standard of judgment. It is true that an optimistic temper has a better chance to picture favorable results to a probation that is beyond the sphere of observation than it has in connection with a probation whose results are in some degree open to inspection. But aside from this one qualification, the doctrine of a Christian probation for all has no more affiliation with Universalism than the opposing hypothesis that a large section of the race is permitted to enter heaven on easy terms. With advocates who are not optimistic, the Andover theory may be quite as rigorous as the other.

In harmony with the prerogatives which the Congregational polity assigns to the individual church, the holding of the new eschatology was not made a bar to the settling of pastors. But for a time the management of the American Board proceeded on the assumption that it was incompatible with missionary appointments. This made several of the annual meetings of the Board to be seasons of sharp contest. But finally a pacific policy, furthered in no small degree by

the ecclesiastical statesmanship of Dr. Storrs, was inaugurated, on the basis of a somewhat faint discrimination against the Andover theory. At the meeting of 1891, the clouds which had been darkening the prospect seemed very largely to have vanished. In the same year the case of Professor Smyth, who had been adjudged deposed by the Board of Visitors, as teaching doctrines incompatible with his subscription to the creed of the Andover Seminary, was decided by the civil court in the professor's favor, to the extent that the action of the Board was declared to have been taken in a faulty manner, and therefore to be invalid. This decision, being given on the basis of technicality, left the merits of the case untouched. It did not reflect therefore on the judgment of those Congregationalists who maintained that Andover's "Progressive Orthodoxy" cannot fairly be reconciled with the old creed which was put into the foundation of the Seminary.

Among the important practical measures which have been consummated by the Congregationalists in recent years, special note may properly be made of the establishment of the National Council in 1871, the initiation of the New West Education Commission in 1879, and the organization of a great company of young people into societies of Christian Endeavor since 1881.

3. PRESBYTERIANS AND REFORMED.—In the first years of the century the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky was the field of an agitation which led to a schism. The occasion was the great revival in that region. On account of the rapid extension of the Church an urgent demand was created for ministerial service. Under

these conditions some of the clergy were willing to abate the requirement for thorough scholastic training, and so gave their voice to licensing comparatively uneducated men. Within the same circle also there was a preponderant tendency to challenge the doctrine of absolute predestination. As the Synod would not tolerate either deviation from the old paths, a separation took place. The new body, which came to be known as the Cumberland Synod, advanced with considerable rapidity. In 1890 its membership amounted to nearly 165,000. In creed the Cumberland Presbyterians endeavored to swing clear of what they regarded as the fatalism of the Westminister standards. Calvinistic specialties were eliminated from these standards in 1814, and a position was assumed which differs little from the Arminian except in the retention of the doctrine of the perseverance of the truly regenerate.

In the Presbyterian Church at large the events most calculated to attract public attention have been connected with the antagonism between conservatives and progressives, or between the Old School and the New School, as they have been called. As was noticed above, the former party was much exercised over the infection which the New England theology, especially of the New Haven type, was bringing across the Presbyterian borders, and began to look askance at the "Plan of Union" as promoting the contagion. The latter party favored a measure of liberty in doctrinal views. In place of requiring strict construction of the standards, it was content to take them for "substance of doctrine."

By the fourth decade the apprehensions of the conser-

vatives had reached a point that threatened a severance of fellowship. Heresy trials were precipitated under conditions which indicated an indisposition to tolerate any modification of stringent Calvinism. In 1832 George Duffield was censured by the Presbytery of Carlisle for teachings contained in a work on regeneration. In 1835 charges were brought against Lyman Beecher, who had entered the Presbyterian Church when accepting the professorship of theology in Lane Seminary. Though in the general tenor of his thinking he was undoubtedly a sturdy champion of the evangelical faith, he was accused of holding and promulgating anti-Scriptural and Pelagian doctrines, of slandering the Church, and dealing hypocritically with its confession. To its credit, the Presbytery refused to second the voice of the accuser. In the Synod also, to which the case was appealed, Beecher was acquitted. It was the purpose of the persistent accuser to carry the matter before the General Assembly of 1836; but the appeal was withdrawn, if we may trust the prosecutor's account, in order to await the issue of another case involving like principles. This was the case of Albert Barnes. At the time of his settlement in Philadelphia, in 1830, complaints were made respecting his supposed heterodoxy, and an agitation was begun which ran on through the succeeding years. In 1835 he was charged with teaching contrary to the Scriptures and the creed in ten particulars, which were assumed to be discoverable in his "Notes on the Epistle to the Romans." Some of the specifications were sufficiently warped, reading into the language of the commentator a meaning that he had no intention of inculcating. Others had some reason-

able ground, that is, on the part of one interpreting the Scriptures by the creed and insisting moreover upon a strict construction of the creed. In the view of President Junkin, who preferred the charges, no other method was admissible. To impeach the framework of legal conceptions in which God and man had been enclosed by his system appeared to him to nullify the whole gospel. "The doctrine of imputation," he said, "is fundamental in the Christian system. Destroy this and all is gone. Deny this and affirm what else you please, it is all to no purpose. Adam's sin is imputed, that is, charged in law to his posterity; and Christ's righteousness is imputed, that is, charged in law to his posterity — his spiritual seed. Do you not see and feel this to be the very essence of the gospel?" Thus it was argued that unless men are made sinners by legal fiction they cannot have any real Saviour; and that consequently the "Notes on the Epistle to the Romans" contained an assault upon fundamental truth. In the Presbytery the charges were not sustained; but the Synod took the opposite side and pronounced Barnes suspended from all ministerial functions. The General Assembly, after a full hearing of the case, annulled the suspension by a considerable majority, and by a less majority refused to censure the teaching contained in the Notes on Romans.

Instead of quietly accepting this defeat, the members of the conservative party were nerved to new determination. Special preparations were made by them for the Assembly of 1837,—a preliminary convention being held to secure united and efficient action on the part of those who were aggrieved by the decisions of the Assembly of 1836. Somewhat unexpectedly they found

that they had a majority of the Assembly. Accordingly, instead of saving the interests of orthodoxy by withdrawing, as had been contemplated with more or less seriousness, they resorted to the policy of expulsion. After abrogating the Plan of Union, they voted to cut off the synods where it had prevailed, and where naturally New School theology had a considerable constituency. The Synods of Utica, Geneva, Genesee, and the Western Reserve were included in the exscinding act, as also the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, to which Barnes belonged. This was virtually wholesale excommunication without the form of trial,—excommunication of sixty thousand members, at least as regards any privilege of representation in the supreme tribunal of the Presbyterian Church.

The roll of the Assembly of 1838 was made out in accordance with the exscinding acts. It only remained therefore to those who were denied seats in the body, or who were unwilling to recognize the legal force of the exscinding acts, to organize another Assembly. This was at once accomplished. From this time till the reunion in 1869 Presbyterianism in the United States flowed in two main channels,—the Old School and the New School.

The larger proportion of the Southern Presbyterians adhered to the Old School. This fact doubtless helped the tendency of their Northern confederates to be somewhat more reticent on the subject of slavery than was the rival party. In the New School slavery became a cause for the separation of the Southern wing—numbering about one hundred ministers—in 1857–58. The Southern branch of the Old School severed connection

with the churches of the North at the outbreak of the Rebellion in 1861. Three years later it was joined by the New School party in that section. Though making room for modifications in polity, Presbyterianism in the South seems to have set its face rather firmly against doctrinal innovation. One of the reasons presented in 1870 for rejecting overtures for reunion with the Northern Assembly was the alleged sacrifice of Calvinistic orthodoxy in the recently consummated fusion of the Old School and the New School of the North. "The union," it was said in the response, "now consummated between the Old and New School Assemblies, North, was accomplished by methods which in our judgment involve a total surrender of all the great testimonies of the Church for the fundamental doctrines of grace, at a time when the victory of truth over error hung long in the balance. The United Assembly stands of necessity upon an allowed latitude of interpretation of the standards, and must come at length to embrace nearly all shades of doctrinal belief. Of those falling testimonies we are the sole surviving heirs, which we must lift from the dust and bear to the generations after us."

The latitude which is here complained of amounted to a concession that the standards might be held in any sense which does not militate against the integrity of the Calvinistic system. No other basis of union was feasible. Indeed, there were diversities of belief in each of the two parties, which, inasmuch as they had been tolerated, practically involved such a principle of interpretation as was adopted for the united Church. Among the promoters of the reunion an eminent place was occupied by Henry B. Smith, whose theological sys-

tem embodied a conservative type of New School doctrine.

A bulwark of Old School views was provided about the time of the reunion in the "Systematic Theology" of Charles Hodge, an elaborate reproduction and able defence of the Calvinism of the seventeenth century. But however much it may have stood in the way of innovation, recent events have abundantly indicated that it has not been able to keep from the Presbyterian domain the pervasive tendencies of the modern era. As if the intellect of the Church had been touched by a subtle force in the theological atmosphere of the times, the fact was recently made plain that the Westminster standards were no longer satisfactory to a large proportion of those whose beliefs they were supposed to formulate. Speaking of the progress of the agitation for revision, one of its foremost representatives remarks: "It is one of those movements that are long in preparing, and that suddenly burst forth with irresistible might and omnipotent energy. We are in the beginning of a theological reformation that can no more be resisted than the flow of a great river."¹

While a minority has expressed a preference for retaining the Westminster Confession intact, some have voted to modify it a little, others to amend it more largely, and others to lay it aside in favor of a new and simpler creed. The spirit in which the more earnest advocates of change have urged the issue is well indicated by the following vigorous statements: "The question which underlies the whole situation, and on which the whole philosophy of revision hinges, is simply this:

¹ Papers on Revision, 1890, Art. I. by C. A. Briggs.

Shall we as a Church retain, as part of our Confession, statements which are admitted to be non-essential to our system of doctrine; which are not supported by the express declarations of Scripture; which, if not absolutely rejected by the large majority of our ministers, are never preached or urged on others; which are at the best misunderstood by other evangelical believers; and which, as long as they are retained, present our Calvinism to the world as something hard, unsympathetic, unlovely, unattractive, and so far powerless for good? The friends of revision are satisfied that the Calvinism which three fourths of our evangelical brethren of other communions reject is not the Calvinism which we ourselves hold. The 'hard side' of Calvinism, of which we have heard so much, is for the most part extra-Scriptural, if not un-Scriptural. Its gloomy, repellent features are largely the excrescence of a presumptuous logic, and of a one-sided dogmatic exegesis. The 'reprobation' of the Westminster Confession is nowhere affirmed in Scripture. The proof-texts of our 'hard doctrines,' to be sure, are taken from the Bible; the misfortune is that they prove nothing of what they are cited to prove. The ninth of Romans is no doubt a magnificent ironclad argument; but a false confessional exegesis has wrested it to uses—misuses, let me say—of which Paul never dreamed. Paul never cries out *Decretum horribile fateor!* . . . The time seems to have come for the Presbyterian Church to take some steps toward a confession more visibly Christo-centric; more visibly suffused with the solar splendors of the truth that God is love,—a confession that can be accepted lovingly as well as sincerely; that can be urged on others without apology that fails to conciliate, or

explanations that fail to explain; that will inspire enthusiasm as well as loyalty; that will attract, not repel.”²

Contemporary with the discussion of revision the subject of Biblical criticism has been agitated in the Presbyterian Church. The bold and somewhat unguarded expressions of Professor Briggs in the inaugural address which signalized his transference, in Union Seminary, to the chair of Biblical Theology, were thought to assign too much to reason and the Church, and to be disparaging to the authority of the Bible. Conservative minds were also unpleasantly affected by the professor’s conclusion that the process of sanctification is not always finished at death, but has a place in the other world. As regards Biblical authority, examination has elicited the fact that, while the professor, along with the majority of scientific students, abandons the rigid and technical theory of inspiration, he still regards the Scriptures as the incomparable authority,—infallible as a rule of faith and practice when taken in their entirety, though not inerrant on each and every subordinate or incidental matter.

The General Assembly which convened in May, 1893, so far as a majority vote has efficacy in questions of belief, has put these teachings under the ban, having promulgated a censure against the doctrine of the errancy of Scripture, against the competency of reason and the Church to share in any wise the domain of authority with the Bible, and against the notion that the sanctification of any souls is carried forward after death. But a respectable minority has refused to in-

¹ Papers on Revision, Art. II. by Prof. Llewellyn J. Evans.

dorse the action of the Assembly. Meanwhile Professor Briggs holds his place in Union Seminary.

The present disposition of the Presbyterian Church not to tolerate liberal views of the Bible has also been illustrated in the case of H. P. Smith, of Lane Theological Seminary, whose position may be described as that of a temperate concession to the demands of recent Biblical criticism.

The contention against the recent trend of Biblical criticism has naturally reinforced for the time being the reactionary tendency within the Presbyterian Church. The project of creed-revision, which was such a living issue in 1890 and 1891, is likely to remain in abeyance till the demands of conscience, consistency, and scholarship find a more favorable opportunity for a hearing than is possible under the strain of partisan feeling.

Of the older branches of Presbyterianism, the Dutch Reformed Church — officially styled the Reformed Church in America, since 1867 — seems to have pursued for the most part an even course in the nineteenth century. Through the immigration of Hollanders its original limits have been transcended, and congregations have been formed in the West.

Up to the close of the first quarter of the century the German Reformed Church progressed but slowly. At this time a revival occurred, but it became of doubtful benefit to the communion, since the methods which were employed by one of its chief agents, John Weinbrenner, were discountenanced by some of his brethren, and he was led ultimately to found a new sect, which called itself the Church of God, but is popularly known as the Weinbrennerians. Shortly before this defection, or

in the year 1825, a much needed provision for ministerial training was made in the founding of a theological seminary. The school proved to be of an itinerating habit. Its home between 1837 and 1871 was at Mercersburg.

An era in the history of the seminary, and indeed of the German Reformed Church, was marked by the labors of J. W. Nevin and Philip Schaff, the former of whom came to the chair of Theology in 1840, the latter to that of Church History and Biblical Literature in 1844. Writings of Nevin, beginning from 1846, gave currency to what is known as the "Mercersburg theology." The term was not descriptive of a very definite system. It was indicative mainly of the fact that Nevin's standpoint was more positively churchly, and more allied with sacramentalism, than was the ordinary position of Reformed theologians in this country. The name of Schaff is less closely associated with a particular doctrinal scheme, and suggests rather an extensive and fruitful activity in the field of Church History. The first fruits of his learning and industry were given to the public in 1851, when his "History of the Apostolic Church" appeared in German.

4. **METHODISTS.** — The history of Methodism in the United States, since the closing years of the eighteenth century, is a history of large advances in membership, of a conservative progress in respect of polity, and of the organization of important instrumentalities for promoting various branches of religious work. Theologically its record presents no marked transitions. Doubtless in a considerable portion of its constituency there has been some modification of doctrinal views.

Men who come in contact with the critical activity of the age, and read philosophies which differ so widely from that of Locke as do many of the recent systems, will take of necessity a little different theological impress than that afforded by the writings of Wesley and Watson. Still, the change thus far effected consists not so much in cancelling principal items in the old beliefs as in giving some of them new shadings.

In the matter of polity the General Conference of 1808 took an important step by providing that henceforth it should meet as a delegated body, and by bringing its powers under certain definite constitutional limitations. By the terms of the "Restrictive Rules," as then adopted, the General Conference was made incompetent to change the Articles of Religion or the General Rules, to abolish episcopacy, with its characteristic of itinerancy, to take away the right of trial and appeal on the part of accused members, and to appropriate the produce of the Book Concern and the Chartered Fund to any other purpose than the benefit of the ministers and their families.¹ To depart from any of these restrictions was henceforth to be inadmissible, except by the joint recommendation of all the Annual Conferences, and a two-thirds majority of the General Conference. In 1832 the restrictions, with the exception of that covering the Articles of Religion, were made capable of amendment on condition of the concurrence of three fourths of the preachers voting in

¹ The Book Concern dates from 1789, and probably existed in an incipient form some years earlier. Its location in New York occurred in 1804. The Chartered Fund, which was designed to benefit ministers receiving an inadequate support, was instituted by action of the General Conference of 1796.

the Annual Conferences and two thirds of the members of the General Conference.

The meeting of the first delegated General Conference, in 1812, marked a new phase in the history of the episcopate as emphasizing its purely executive function. "Prior to this time the bishops were members of the General Conference, and had equal rights upon the floor; they made motions and took part in the debates. From this time forward their duties were limited to the simple office of presiding."¹

The period of fifteen or sixteen years which followed the second delegated General Conference may be noted as a fruitful era in respect of the introduction of new agencies. In 1817 a Tract Society was founded in close connection with the Book Concern in New York. The next year the "Methodist Magazine," to which the title of "Quarterly Review" was given later, began to be published. In 1819 the Missionary Society was organized, with which was also connected a Bible Society for seventeen years. The Sunday School Union was initiated in 1827. Along with these instrumentalities the Church was furnished with better educational facilities. New Market Academy, started in 1817 and transferred to Wilbraham in 1824-25, other institutions of similar grade, Augusta College, Kentucky, chartered in 1822, and Wesleyan University at Middletown, Conn., opened under the presidency of Wilbur Fisk in 1831,—proclaimed that the Methodist body had passed out of its season of relative discouragement, and was now ready to move forward energetically in the work of academic and collegiate education.

¹ Bishop Simpson, *A Hundred Years of Methodism*, 1876.

The era of theological schools came a little later. In 1839 a convention was called in Boston to consult for such a means of ministerial education. The proposed institution obtained a very shadowy existence, in fact a merely theoretical standing, in connection with the Wesleyan University; then appeared as the Biblical Institute at Newbury, Vermont; then was metamorphosed, in 1847, into the Concord Biblical Institute; and finally, in 1867, was transferred to Boston, where in 1871 it became a part of the Boston University. The patriarch of the school was John Dempster, who became theological professor in 1845. His enterprise was a chief factor in the success of the struggling institution. Having won this crown in the East, it was his happiness to win a second in the West, as he was among the founders of Garrett Biblical Institute at Evanston, Illinois, which was opened in 1854. Twelve years later the foundation was provided for the Drew Theological Seminary, at Madison, New Jersey.

A conservative progress in respect of polity was mentioned as characteristic of Methodism during the nineteenth century. This has been illustrated in the feature of itinerancy. While the scheme of annual appointments has been steadfastly maintained, the rule determining the possible number of reappointments to the same station has been modified. In 1804 the limit of the pastoral term was fixed at two years, in 1864 at three years, in 1888 at five years.

Another illustration of cautious advance appears in connection with the subject of lay delegation. The inception of the agitation on this subject seems to have been closely connected with the discussion of the propo-

sition to make the presiding elders elective. A proposition of this kind was made at the General Conference of 1808, and was a subject of earnest debate for the next twenty years. The question concerned the prerogatives of the ministers as against those of the bishops. By a not unnatural transition, the canvassing of the rights of one party in the church economy led to a consideration of the rights of other parties. The local preachers began to inquire whether they were assigned a suitable share in the management of the church. Finally the question was raised whether the laity ought not to be represented in the higher tribunals. A mouthpiece for the advocates of democratic changes was obtained in 1821 in the "Wesleyan Repository," which a few years later was merged in the "Mutual Rights" published at Baltimore. Since it was made manifest at the General Conference of 1828 that the proposed measures could not be carried, their more zealous supporters seceded from the Methodist Episcopal Church. In forming a new communion, called the Methodist Protestant Church, they discarded episcopacy, made the president of their Annual Conferences elective, and admitted an equal number of laymen with the ministers to their General Conference. The principles of lay delegation and non-episcopal organization were also adopted by the Wesleyan Methodist Connection, though the slavery question, as was noticed, gave the principal incentive to their separation. After the formation of the Methodist Protestant Church, the subject of lay delegation was laid comparatively to rest for an interval in the main body of Methodists. Probably its serious consideration was postponed by the intervention of the slavery agitation and the disruption of 1844.

The circumstances of the disruption have already been noticed in part. The best feature in the affair was the solemnity and absence of passion with which steps toward a separation were taken. One who was intimately acquainted with the General Conference of 1844 says: "I do not believe that any one can point to a single incident which might warrant a word of reproach against that body of holy men. They were sometimes, perhaps frequently, wanting as to etiquette in the eagerness of individuals to get the floor, but neither their speeches nor their personal intercourse in Conference, in committees, or in private, can be adduced to prove anything more as to their spirit or temper than that they honestly differed in judgment, while their hearts were strictly right at all times." Unhappily, this good understanding was not perfectly conserved in the following years. The plan of separation which was reported to the General Conference of 1844, was taken by the Methodists of the South more in the character of a finality than was deemed proper by their Northern brethren. In the view of the latter the conditions of its validity were not fulfilled. Their standpoint was expressed in the following declaration at the General Conference of 1848: (1) "The report of the committee of nine, adopted in 1844, was intended to meet a necessity which might arise. (2) It was made dependent on the concurrence of three fourths of the members of the Annual Conferences. (3) It was made dependent, also, upon the observance of the provisions for a boundary line between the two churches should a new church be formed. (4) Action was taken in the premises by the Southern delegates without waiting for

the anticipated necessity. (5) The Annual Conferences have refused to concur in that part of the plan which was submitted to them. (6) The provisions respecting a boundary have been violated by the separating body. (7) There is therefore no obligation resting upon the Methodist Episcopal Church to observe the plan. (8) The plan is hereby declared null and void." In the issue, however, the South obtained the benefit of the plan of separation, inasmuch as the decision of the Supreme Court supported its claim to a proportionate share of denominational property.

After the division the Northern and Southern branches enjoyed about the same rate of increase till the outbreak of the Civil War. In that terrible ordeal the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, suffered a loss which was not fully offset till six or seven years after the return of peace. While in 1860 the number of her white members was 542,489, in 1866 it was but 429,233. A larger proportionate reduction occurred in her colored membership, though here the attraction of rival bodies, rather than the simple ravages of war, was in large part the effective cause. The two African churches, which previously had operated mainly in the North, drew off many,¹ and others were brought into connection with the Northern branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1866 the colored membership, which once numbered

¹ The African Methodist Episcopal Church originated in 1815, with its headquarters at Philadelphia. The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church was started at New York in 1820. Both were formed by secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Zion Church is distinguished in polity by the assignment of a limited term of office to its bishops or superintendents. In 1892 a plan was projected for the union of these two African churches.

207,766, was reported as 78,742. They were constituted in 1872 an independent body under the name of "The Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in America."¹

At the second General Conference after the separation between the Northern and Southern wings of Methodism, or in 1852, attention was again called to the subject of lay delegation. The report of the committee to which the matter was intrusted discountenanced the proposed innovation as being neither needed by the laity nor desired by the greater part of them. The latter assumption received a seeming confirmation in 1861. The people being allowed to vote on the question in that year gave a considerable majority against lay delegation. But the agitation for the change was now prosecuted under better conditions than in the early part of the century, when the issue was compromised by being conjoined with a disaffection toward the episcopate. A decade sufficed to reverse the verdict of 1861. At the General Conference of 1872 lay delegates took their seats beside their ministerial brethren. In the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the provision for lay delegation went into effect in 1870. In the Southern scheme a larger place was given to the laity than in the Northern. While the latter simply opened the door of the General Conference to two lay delegates from the limits of each Annual Conference (providing at the same time that a Conference so small as to have only one ministerial delegate should have but one lay representative), the former secured that the laity should be equally represented with the clergy in the General Conference,

¹ The figures in this paragraph are from McTyeire's History of Methodism.

and should also be represented in the Annual Conferences at the rate of four delegates from each district.

The appearance of women among the lay delegates presenting credentials to the Northern General Conference in 1888 raised a constitutional question as to their admissibility. It was decided to submit the question to the vote of the Church. Though a majority of laymen and ministers gave their verdict in favor of removing any legal bar to the admission of women, it was not the majority required for a constitutional change. The requisite three fourths of the ministers voting in the Annual Conferences was not obtained. While the subject was pending, an animated debate was conducted, involving a more extended examination of the subject of woman's place in the ecclesiastical organism than had been undertaken previously in the ranks of Methodists. Among those arguing against the proper eligibility of women to the legislative assembly of the Church an active part was taken by Dr. J. M. Buckley, of the "New York Advocate;" while President W. F. Warren, of Boston University, ably supported the conclusion that it would be in no wise contrary to Scripture or the providential order of society to admit women to such an assembly, under a scheme which should bring them there by the initiative and consent of their Christian brothers.

Though closing its doors to women, the General Conference of 1888 made a new provision for utilizing their Christian tact and devotion by arranging for a system of deaconess institutes. At an earlier date (1869) the establishment of the Women's Foreign Missionary Society had given them a field for beneficent activity.

Among the more recent agencies of Methodist work, it is appropriate to mention the Church Extension Society, which has been an efficient instrument since 1865; the Freedmen's Aid Society, dating from 1866; the Chautauqua system, which since 1878 has given intellectual stimulus and satisfaction to tens of thousands by its reading courses; and the Epworth League, which was initiated in 1889, and has already (1894) associated more than six hundred thousand young people for religious effort. The Chautauqua scheme, it is true, is not confined to a Methodist constituency; but it has much currency therein, and its founder, J. H. Vincent, ranks as one of the eminent practical workers of Methodism.

Since the early part of the nineteenth century the most noted orators of the Methodist pulpit—not to mention John Summerfield, who came to America in 1821, and produced a profound impression during his brief career—have been Henry B. Bascom, Stephen Olin, John P. Durbin, and Matthew Simpson. The fame of Bascom attests the great power of his discourses, though criticism has hardly awarded to him the highest type of eloquence, inasmuch as he was not clear altogether from the appearance of declaiming. Olin had not the polish of manner which characterized Bascom, but he had more of the moral force and self-abandon which tend to merge interest in the theme rather than in the speaker. In correspondence with his gigantic frame his speech was distinguished by massive strength. "In overmastering power in the pulpit," wrote McClintock, "we doubt whether living he had a rival, or dying, has left his like among men. Nor did his power consist in any single quality,—in force of reasoning, or fire of

imagination, or heat of declamation, — but in all combined. His course of argument was always clear and strong, yet interfused throughout with a fervid and glowing passion, — the two inseparably united in a torrent that overwhelmed all who listened to him.”¹ Durbin seemed to have a dual personality in the pulpit. After figuring for a time as the prosaic argumentative speaker, he was wont at length to be rapt up into an intense mood, where he had easy command of his materials, his words blended harmoniously with his action, and his imagination moved with a most daring yet certain flight. Simpson, whose episcopal journeys made him well-known throughout the length and breadth of the land, met the average audience on its own plane, and gradually, by the power of the sympathy and spiritual intensity which tempered his flowing speech, lifted up his hearers to a high plane of religious feeling and apprehension. In the minds of tens of thousands to recall the image of this great preacher is to strengthen impressions and convictions respecting the reality of the spiritual world.

Could a larger space be awarded to personal items, it would be appropriate to present something more than the mere names of such educators and organizers of education as Wilbur Fisk, John Dempster, and W. F. Warren; also of such writers on topics of theology, Biblical interpretation, or history, as John McClintock, D. D. Whedon, A. T. Bledsoe, William Nast, Abel Stevens, Miner Raymond, T. O. Summers, James Strong, C. W. Bennett, John Miley, G. R. Crooks, Daniel Steele, John Hurst, and Daniel Dorchester, not to mention

¹ Quoted in *Life and Letters of Olin.*

others of more recent but scarcely inferior reputation. In the line of metaphysics an enviable standing has been won by Professor Borden P. Bowne. Probably no writer or teacher of the present generation has better fulfilled the very essential task of introducing students to an all-sided view of philosophical problems.

5. **BAPTISTS AND DISCIPLES.**—As a denomination the Baptists in this country have followed close upon the Methodists in successful church enterprise. In the early part of the nineteenth century, however, there was a section of the Baptists who were not yet ready to vote that the "quiet period" should come to an end. So far from being disposed to take the kingdom of heaven by violence, it was their controlling aim to stand still and see the salvation of God. Such human devices as missionary organizations, Sunday-schools, and Bible societies, they considered as attempts to crowd the Lord aside from the management of His own affairs; in other words, they condemned them as unjustifiable encroachments upon the divine sovereignty. Some of these ultra Calvinists became separatists. In 1844 the anti-effort or Anti-Mission Baptists, as they have been called, numbered about sixty thousand.

Schools devoted especially to ministerial training began to be provided among the Baptists near the close of the second decade. The Maine Literary and Theological Institution, at Waterville, which ultimately grew into Colby University, was opened in 1818. Two years later a similar institution, which formed the nucleus for Madison University, was opened at Hamilton, New York. The theological department of the latter was continu-

ously maintained, but from the founding of the seminary at Newton, Massachusetts, in 1825, this department was discontinued in the institution at Waterville. The third theological seminary of the denomination was organized at Rochester, New York, in 1850.

Slavery became a dividing wedge to the Baptists in 1845, or very near the time in which the same cause had sundered the Methodist body. The schism has not yet been healed. Much the larger proportion of communicants belongs to the Southern States, where the Baptists make a considerable fraction of both the white and the colored population. Since the Civil War many of the colored Baptists have entered into connection with Northern Associations or assumed an independent status.

While differing from their Northern brethren on the subject of negro slavery, the Southern Baptists have shown that on occasion they are ready to defend the denominational principle respecting ecclesiastical freedom. A good illustration was given in Georgia in 1863. "The new code of Georgia provided, in section 1376, that 'it shall be unlawful for any church, society, or other body, or any persons, to grant any license or other authority to any slave or free person of color to preach, or exhort, or otherwise officiate in church matters.' This aroused the Baptists of the State, and a very powerful paper was sent in remonstrance and protest to the Legislature, demanding the repeal of this iniquitous provision. They denounced it 'as a seizure by force of the things that are God's, and a rendering them unto Cæsar; an usurpation of ecclesiastical power by civil authorities.' . . . They protested that it was an offence against one hundred thousand Baptist communicants in the State,

and that the Baptist Church in Columbia, ‘with the new code spread open before their eyes, and with a full knowledge and understanding of the intent and meaning of section 1376, and after a thorough discussion of its provisions, deliberately violated the same, and ordained two negroes to officiate in church matters in the office of deacon.’ They claim that the obnoxious law ‘trespasses not only on the rights of men, but on the rights of God. It dictates to the Almighty what color his preachers shall be.’¹ Evidently the protest scarcely fell short of being a defiance. The offending section was repealed.

In 1835 the exclusive theory of the Baptists respecting the form of baptism began to disturb their relation with the American Bible Society, with which they had co-operated since its foundation in 1816. The society at the former date expressed the conclusion that in the versions prepared by the aid of its funds the Greek words denoting the rite of baptism should be transferred rather than interpreted. The Baptists, on the other hand, while they were at that time content with the simple transference of the Greek words, so far as concerned the English version, insisted that, when the Bible was rendered into foreign tongues by their own missionaries, the words should be interpreted according to Baptist ideas, or, as they preferred to put the case, should be translated. As a result of the disagreement, the Baptists proceeded to form a society of their own (1836–37), entitled the American and Foreign Bible Society. For a time the policy of this society to circulate the common English version met but little opposition.

¹ Armitage, History of the Baptists, pp. 774, 775.

But the impatience of those who argued that English readers are quite as much entitled to an unadulterated translation as are foreigners and heathens, worked like a leaven, and at length in 1850 issued in the organization of an additional society, the American Bible Union, which at once projected a revision of the English Bible. The revised New Testament, as prepared under the auspices of the society, was published in 1865. As this revision was not a mere change of terms on the single subject of baptism, but was prosecuted with much of critical industry, by the labors of such Baptist scholars as T. J. Conant, H. B. Hackett, and A. C. Kendrick, together with the assistance of some divines of other communions, it afforded a valuable preliminary to the revision for the English-speaking world which was projected by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1870.

The Baptists in recent times have found considerable support for their special ceremonial postulate in the verdicts of antiquarians and exegetes. But many of these verdicts are modified by a very significant qualification. Non-Baptist scholars who are persuaded with Dean Stanley that baptism was commonly administered in the first age of the Church by immersion, are quite apt to feel with him that a departure from that mode was a laudable triumph of common-sense over ancient custom. Many of them entertain the opinion that the mode was largely an accident of the conditions then existing, and that the Lord does not care in the least whether a scanty or a large quantity of water is employed, so long as in baptism the headship of Christ is sincerely acknowledged. Nor can this feeling be expected to diminish, unless there is to be in Christian

society a profound revulsion toward the standpoint of technicality and legality. It is to be feared therefore, notwithstanding the long list of names selected by Baptist apologists from the ranks of exegetes, lexicographers, and historians, that the jubilee of the world's conversion to their exclusive tenets cannot be celebrated very soon. New evidences that the early Church allowed baptism by other modes than immersion, like that which was given to the world not long since in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," will not tend to hasten the day of that hypothetical jubilee.

In the formative stage of their history (1809-1830) the Disciples of Christ, or Campbellites, —as they are sometimes called by outsiders, from their founders, Thomas and Alexander Campbell,— were in association with the Baptists. In requiring immersion and rejecting infant baptism they still remain true to Baptist principles. Their primary and distinctive tenet, however, and the one which led them to emerge into a separate communion, was their opposition to the imposition of creeds, as being a fatal bar to unity. To avoid divisions, they argued, "nothing ought to be required as a term of union, communion, and co-operation that is not as old as the New Testament." Notwithstanding the absence of binding formulas they have maintained a tolerably firm consensus of belief, and proclaim in their pulpits the doctrines which evangelical denominations generally regard as fundamental. Numerically they have had a fair measure of success; but in the effort to find a cure for the divisions of Protestantism they have accomplished little, unless their testimony has a potency which is not discoverable to ordinary eyes.

As has been more than once illustrated in this country, to organize a new denomination for the sake of reducing the number of the old is a doubtful expedient.

6. **EPISCOPALIANS.**—It was noticed that inefficient management in the colonial period, and the overturning incident to the era of the Revolution left the Episcopal Church with a somewhat scanty inheritance. A basis for better fortunes was laid in the successful attempt at unification and reorganization which was consummated in 1789. For a time, however, the forward movement was not rapid. The first bishops were rectors of parishes, and gave but moderate attention to church enterprises in the broader sense. There was also in the constitutional theories commonly entertained an obstruction to organic missionary effort. The State idea was dominant. It was thought that bishoprics should be conformed to the limits of the several States, and that only when there were enough Episcopalians in a State to justify the election of a bishop could any provision be made for their episcopal supervision. Up to that point it was necessary to leave them comparatively unshepherded. Thus there was no instrument for propagandism upon a national scale. But this embarrassing theory was at length outgrown. After some previous mitigations it was cast completely away in 1835. The General Convention of that year, besides constituting a Board of Managers which should represent the whole membership in efforts for church extension, provided for the sending of missionary bishops in advance of any request for them.¹

¹ S. D. McConnell, *History of the American Episcopal Church*, p. 309.

As respects the distribution of powers, there has been a general tendency to enlarge the prerogatives of the General Convention, and thus to render nugatory the stipulation in the original Act of Association, 'that no powers be delegated to a general ecclesiastical government, except such as cannot conveniently be exercised by the clergy and laity in their respective congregations.' While the bishops in their collective capacity, as being able to negative measures proposed in the other houses of the General Convention, have had large powers since 1808, there has been considerable restriction of the sphere of their individual jurisdiction. The right of initiative in the exercise of clerical discipline has passed mainly into other hands. In the prerogative of inspection the Diocesan Convention takes precedence of the bishop; and reports on the state of the churches and the behavior of the clergy are made to it rather than to him. Also in the selection of candidates for ordination the bishop has a limited function. The Standing Committee, from being his agent to examine candidates, has come to be thought of as representing the clergy and laity in making necessary recommendations of candidates.¹

Naturally, somewhat of a reflex of the special developments in the Anglican establishment has appeared within the Episcopalian body in this country. In the first years of the reorganized Church the Evangelical School had its representatives, such as Pilmoor in Philadelphia, Percy in South Carolina, and Duke in Maryland. In the following years the succession was well maintained through Hopkins, Boyd, Bull, and Bedell in

¹ McConnell, 267-269.

Pennsylvania; Milnor and Channing Moore in New York; McIlvain in Brooklyn; Henshaw and Johns in Baltimore; Tyng, Bristed, and Crocker in New England. The theological seminary in Virginia was made a stronghold of the party; and in the same State it had perhaps its most illustrious leader,—the deeply pious, eloquent and earnest William Meade.¹ At the same time a High Church party was being formed, the ablest leader of which was Henry Hobart, who became Associate-Bishop of New York in 1811 and shortly afterwards took full charge of the diocese. Bishop Ravenscroft, of North Carolina, was an advocate of High-Church principles in the South. Much of the zeal of the Evangelicals was expended in foreign missions, while a chief part in home missions was relegated to the High-Church party. This enabled the latter to give its impress to many of the new churches in the West, and worked toward its relative advancement in the country.

In correspondence with the predilections of these two parties, the Oxford, or Tractarian, movement was diversely judged. Bishop McIlvain, speaking for the Evangelicals, pronounced it “a systematic abandonment of the vital and distinguishing principles of the Protestant faith, and a systematic adoption of that very root and heart of Romanism whence has issued the life of all its ramified corruptions and deformities.”² On the other hand, there were some in the High Church ranks who were ready to espouse and defend the Tractarian standpoint. The Romanizing tendency of their agency was soon manifest. Still, the number of those

¹ Perry, History of the American Episcopal Church, ii., 191-193.

² Oxford Divinity, 1841.

who formally betook themselves to the Romish Church was not large. The effect of the apostasy of Bishop Ives, of North Carolina, was much qualified by the unseemly evasions which preceded his withdrawal, and which presented his character in a very unenviable light. Some of the lower clergy took the path to Rome, numbering, from first to last, perhaps fifty priests and deacons.¹

In its American environment the Episcopal Church could reap only a doubtful advantage from the intensified ecclesiasticism and denominational exclusiveness which were fostered by Tractarian doctrines. As if conscious of the need of some offset, a party began to agitate near the middle of the century for an enlargement of the practical activity of the Church, and, to this end, for such an increase of liberty in the forms of public worship as would be inviting to those who had any thought of ministering at Episcopalian altars. In behalf of this project, a number of men, headed by W. A. Muhlenberg, presented a memorial to the assembled bishops in 1853. In this paper it is declared that a wider door ought to be opened for admission to the gospel ministry; that men who are well qualified to be able ministers of the New Testament ought not to be debarred from exercising their gifts within the Episcopalian communion for the sake of conformity in matters that are unessential; and that in granting this reasonable latitude the Church would be taking an important step towards the effecting of a church unity in the Protestant Christendom of the land. The memorial was respectfully entertained by the bishops in general, and

¹ Perry, History of the American Episcopal Church, ii. 290.

was specially appreciated by Alonzo Potter, Bishop of Pennsylvania. At the time, however, little was done for the fulfilment of its intent.

The quiescent attitude of the Episcopal Church on the subject of slavery left her Southern members without any ground of disaffection. Slave-holding was never made by her a matter of discipline, though some of her children severely censured this neutrality in face of what they considered a great moral evil. While, therefore, the Civil War precipitated a separation, it was only temporary. The collapse of the Southern confederacy left the way open for restored fellowship. Already at the General Convention of 1865 representatives from the South were present and were received as if no rupture had occurred.

As in England it required an interval for Tractarian doctrine to flower forth in ritualistic practice of the more advanced, or Romish type, so also in the United States. Special attention was called to this kind of practice in 1866, and it became a chief item of debate in several General Conventions. Definite legislation was first reached in 1874, when a canon was passed in condemnation of practices defined as unauthorized and symbolical of erroneous or doubtful doctrines, such as : “(1) The elevation of the elements in the Holy Communion in such a manner as to expose them to the view of the people, as objects toward which adoration is to be made. (2) Any act of adoration of or toward the elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, or genuflections. (3) All other like acts not authorized by the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer.” In the preceding year the Assistant-Bishop

of Kentucky, George D. Cummins, offended by the apparent advance of ritualism and High Church tendencies in the Episcopalian body, had withdrawn. Under his auspices the "Reformed Episcopal Church" was instituted, in which ritual is kept within moderate limits, and all sacerdotal and ultra-sacramental theories are discarded. As yet it has not won a large following.

The plea for action in the direction of unity which Muhlenberg and others urged in the memorial of 1853 has been responded to recently in a proposal for the reunion of Christendom on the basis of certain specified terms. As revised by the Lambeth Conference, representing the Church of England and her daughters, these terms are as follows: "(1) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith. (2) The Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith. (3) The two sacraments ordained by Christ Himself — Baptism and the Supper of the Lord — ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him. (4) The historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church." The element of ambiguity in these specifications evidently lies mainly in the fourth. The "historic episcopate" may mean more or less. If it means that there is no valid ministry, no legitimate ecclesiastical standing outside of the so-called "apostolic succession," then a vast preliminary work must be accomplished before this union scheme can

have the least chance of adoption. A mere willingness to absorb is not likely to be met by a willingness to be absorbed.

Somewhat of a test of the animus of the Episcopal Church was furnished in the election of Phillips Brooks to the episcopate and his confirmation in the office in 1891. Personally the candidate was of a character to invite a unanimous suffrage, being second to no contemporary representative of the American pulpit in respect of his fame as a great preacher,—a man of commanding presence, inspiring address, and unusual resources for an ever fresh development of Scriptural themes. But he was known also to be a man of very liberal sentiments, insomuch that he was classified with the Broad Church. That his elevation to the episcopate was stoutly opposed by some of his brethren shows that one wing of the denomination regards the High Church ideal as among things most sacred and essential. On the other hand, the fact that a man of his stamp could be elected and confirmed may be taken as an omen that the High Church movement is not soon to win complete ascendancy in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

7. **LUTHERANS.**—The slow progress of the Lutheran Church in the early part of the nineteenth century was succeeded later by a rapid advance. Extensive immigrations from Germany and the Scandinavian countries gave to it a great expansion in the Western States, so that now it ranks among the larger communions.

From the time that the Lutheran Church occupied any considerable stretch of territory it has subsisted in a number of divisions, some of the synods declining to

make connection with a central body, and either remaining severally independent or combining into additional groups. The earliest plan for organic union, which was projected in 1819, and consummated in the meeting of a General Synod in 1821, was only relatively successful. Though the powers of the General Synod were mainly advisory, many congregations feared that its supervision would eventuate in a restriction of liberty. So great was the jealousy on this score within the limits of the Pennsylvania Synod that it felt constrained in 1823 to sever connection with the central body, though its representatives had taken a conspicuous part in forming that body.

One of the first concerns of the General Synod was to make suitable provision for ministerial education. Under its auspices a theological seminary was opened at Gettysburg in 1826. For a period this institution served as the foremost agency in the training of the Lutheran ministry. S. S. Schmucker, who was its first professor in theology, and who continued in his office until 1864, was during a large part of this long term the most influential man of his Church, and the best known to the religious world in general.

Up to 1830 the General Synod represented only the Synods of North Carolina, Maryland and Virginia, and West Pennsylvania. In the following years new members were added, until at length the maximum was reached in 1860, when its constituency included twenty-six synods.

The Civil War led to a distinct organization in the South, the General Synod of the Confederate States being organized in 1863. For an interval this did not

include all the Lutheran bodies in Southern territory; but in 1866, when the Tennessee and Holston Synods joined, Lutheranism in that section came under the oversight of a single body, which was styled the United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South. The doctrinal basis as acknowledged at this time was strictly confessional. Allegiance was declared to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, and the other Lutheran symbols were accepted as "true and Scriptural developments of the doctrines taught in the Augsburg Confession, and in the perfect harmony of one and the same pure Scriptural faith."

About 1850 a reaction toward confessionalism became apparent in the synods of the North. Previously a general adherence to Lutheran symbols had been deemed satisfactory. This was the position of Professor Schmucker, and continued to be his position to the end. But at the middle of the century his disposition to qualify some of the dogmatic peculiarities of Lutheranism began to be regarded by many of his brethren as unwarrantable and pernicious laxity. As the confessional fervor increased, a demand was made for strict subscription, and in 1864 the General Synod so far met the demand as to pass the requirement that all synods seeking connection with it should receive the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word. In the same year, however, the General Synod relaxed its requirement by agreeing to admit the Frankean Synod on the simple promise of its representatives that it would formally adopt the Augsburg Confession. This action was very distasteful to a considerable fraction of the assembly, and afforded

an occasion for their withdrawal and the forming of a new group of synods (1866-67), wherein the central body was called the General Council. The doctrinal standpoint which it adopted was of course strictly confessional. Its widely extended constituency was nearly double that of the parent body at the census of 1890.

A type of confessionalism still more stringent than that of the General Council became dominant in a group of Western synods. The nucleus for this group was formed in 1847 under the title of the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States. With a somewhat democratic view of church polity the synod combined a great attachment to the most primitive and unadulterated system of Lutheran dogmas. These features were championed with special vigor by C. F. W. Walther, who was appointed editor of the official organ, the "*Lutheraner*." In 1872 an extension of fellowship was provided through the formation of the Synodal Conference, which represented at first the Synods of Ohio, Missouri, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, and the Norwegian Synod. The outbreak of the predestinarian controversy within a decade from the union caused the withdrawal of the Ohio and Norwegian Synods.

The anomalous predestinarian revival had its headquarters in the Missouri Synod, and its most stalwart representative in Dr. Walther. Probably no Calvinistic writer of the century has given a more positive statement of the doctrine of unconditional election than the following from the pen of this energetic controversialist: "We believe, teach, and confess that the cause which moved God to choose the elect was purely His

grace and the merit of Jesus Christ, and not any foreseen good in the elect, not even their faith foreseen of God ; and we reject accordingly and condemn the opposing doctrine of the Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians, and Synergists as blasphemous and frightful, an error destructive of the gospel and the whole Christian religion.”¹ The elements of the Missouri doctrine, as thus declared, may indeed be found in the writings of Luther ; but the main current of Lutheranism early began to flow in a different direction, and has continued to do so to the present. Whether this theological offspring, born out of due time, can swim against the current, remains to be proved.

Since the middle of the century, as might be inferred from the increased stress upon the old creeds, a strong church consciousness has been developed within a large portion of the Lutheran body. This is manifest in more or less of a predilection for parish schools. The English portion of the Church, it is true, has not resorted to this instrument of denominational exclusiveness, but the German and Scandinavian congregations have several thousand such schools. A token of the same consciousness may be observed in the confident declarations of various writers respecting the immaculate inheritance of the Lutheran Church. Dr. Walther in a synodal address, delivered in 1866, justified the conviction of his brethren that the Lutheran Church of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession “is the true visible Church of God upon earth,” and that the doctrine laid down in the public confessions of the same is “purer than purified silver tried seven times in the crucible.”² Dr.

¹ Hochstetter, *Die Geschichte der evangelisch lutheranischen Missouri Synode, und ihrer Lehrkämpfe*, p. 389.

² Hochstetter, pp. 469, 470.

Wolf, one of the historians of American Lutheranism, says of his Church: "Of all churches she holds the purest, clearest, most definite, and most complete system of Scriptural doctrine. She is firmly grounded on her symbols, and these stand immovable amid the upheaval and tumult that are shaking some other creeds. . . . Not the faintest voice is heard for a revision of her standards."¹ Dr. Krauth, one of the most scholarly representatives of American Lutheranism, though not claiming for his communion an exclusive right to the name of "Catholic," has indicated clearly enough his conviction that the Lutheran is essentially fitted to be the Universal Church, and has next to nothing to learn from its neighbors.²

Doubtless some Lutherans have spoken words of a different tenor, and sentences parallel to those cited have been uttered by various representatives of other communions. This shows that the movement toward inter-denominational comity and mutual appreciation has its eddies or counter-currents; it does not contradict the fact of a general movement in that direction.

The polity of American Lutherans inclines to the Presbyterian type, though in some of the bodies, including so important a one as the Synodal Conference, there is an approach to the Congregational model.³

¹ *The Lutherans in America*, p. 536.

² See his work entitled the *Conservative Reformation*.

³ A recent historian of American Lutheranism makes the following comments on Lutheran church government: "The synodal form of organization universally prevalent in the Lutheran Church of America is, in large measure, derived from the Reformed Church,—the Lutheran synodal organization of the Reformation period, of which that in Pomerania may be regarded the type, being of an entirely different character, as meetings for

8. QUAKERS.—The special denominational crisis of the Quakers in the first half of the nineteenth century was the schism, which, starting in 1827, divided five out of the eight Yearly Meetings, and gathered into an independent body about a third of the membership as then existing. The occasion of the disruption was the rationalizing teaching which had been spreading for some years under the instruction of an energetic preacher, Elias Hicks. His scheme of doctrine as put by himself has a somewhat misty outline. Its general tendency, however, is sufficiently manifest. Exaggerating a feature of original Quakerism, Hicks and his followers—"Liberal Quakers" or "Progressive Friends"—made so much of the inner light, or their moral and spiritual intuitions, as to disparage notably both written revelation and the objective work of Christ; indeed, their more radical statements came to the very verge of ignoring the historical element in Christianity.

The best type of the old Quaker evangelist, with his roving and testifying habit, was represented up to the middle of the century by Stephen Grellet. Descended from the French nobility, he bore the impress of his antecedents. One of the most readable of Quaker histories thus describes him: "He had the excitable tem-

receiving instructions from the superintendents rather than for the decision of church questions. We believe that it can be very safely affirmed that nowhere as in this country does the Lutheran Church have the opportunity to shape its church polity in accordance with its principles. The temporary scheme in Germany of regarding the rulers as bishops may have been necessary under the circumstances; but it certainly caused great embarrassments, and often led to a denial of Lutheran principles, and even to their flagrant violation." (H. E. Jacobs, *History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States.*)

perament and the courtly manners of his country and his order. It was his excitable temperament which made him see visions and hear voices in his youth,—these softened into ‘impressions’ in his later years,—and though clothed in drab every one saw that he was born to live in kings’ houses. All who heard him speak felt it ; and it is impossible to read his Journal — so full of the imagery of the East, and so tinged with his own elevated piety — without knowing that the man who was master of such language must have captivated many. Then what a great heart he had ; and what a pleasant old face, beaming upon the whole world in tender love. Take him all in all, the world has seldom seen such a man ; and, since the days of George Fox, there had risen no greater Quaker.”¹

9. ROMAN CATHOLICS.—The annexation of Louisiana and Florida in the early part of the nineteenth century added a considerable body to the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. But the increase from this source was moderate compared with that which resulted from the arrival of great swarms of immigrants. After 1845 each year brought an accession of more thousands than the whole communion numbered at the beginning of the century. Of the three hundred thousand immigrants, or more, who on the average were received annually between the former date and 1890, it has been estimated that about three fifths were Roman Catholics. The officiary shows also in a striking manner the immigrant character of the Church. In the list of nearly one hundred bishops who

¹ John Cunningham, International History of the Quakers.

died before the year 1888 about three fourths were foreign born.¹

According to the census of 1890 the number of Roman Catholics in this country was about six and a quarter millions, excluding those below nine years of age. From these figures it is manifest that great losses must have befallen that Church, the whole number of its communicants in the present scarcely exceeding the number of Roman Catholic immigrants in the last fifty years. Various representatives have acknowledged the magnitude of the loss, some of them not hesitating to say that the number of communicants would be double what it is had it not been for defections.

In the earlier decades of the century much of the loss, aside from the influence of the unwonted relations in which the immigrants were placed, was due to the paucity of churches and priests, and to the inability of many of the priests to speak the English language. An occasion of indifference and defection less creditable to the communion was afforded by the character of some of the clergy. A Roman Catholic historian says: "Not a few of the first priests were unworthy of their holy calling,—selfish and insubordinate men. Some of them became apostates; others caused schisms, scandals, and unhappy dissensions."²

Some of the causes of loss were largely obviated with the advance of the century. A vast growth of ecclesiastical appliances took place. Home enterprise was sup-

¹ See R. H. Clarke, *lives of the Deceased Bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States.*

² J. O'Kane Murray, *Popular History of the Catholic Church in America*, 3d edit., pp. 581, 582.

plemented by aid from abroad. The Lyons Propaganda in France, founded in 1822, and the Leopold Society in Austria, founded in 1829, made liberal contributions. The former alone gave to the cause of Romanism in the United States, in the years 1822–1850, 8,977,056 francs. “The amount received from the Leopold Society and all other similar sources has been estimated as high as one quarter of a million of dollars in some years.”¹ By 1850 the number of dioceses had become twenty-seven and that of priests one thousand three hundred and three. At the centennial of Bishop Carroll’s consecration, in 1889, Archbishop Ryan reported: “There are thirteen archbishops, and seventy-one bishops, eight thousand priests, ten thousand and five hundred churches and chapels, twenty-seven seminaries exclusively devoted to the training of candidates for the sacred ministry; there are six hundred and fifty colleges and academies for the higher education of both sexes, thirty-one hundred parish schools; there are five hundred and twenty hospitals and orphan asylums.” The growth of religious orders, whose services are largely employed in charitable and educational work, has been on a corresponding scale. The few orders introduced under the patronage of Bishop Carroll have increased to scores. Sadlier’s Catholic Almanac for 1887 gives the names of one hundred and twelve, seventy-seven of which are orders of sisters and nuns. Some of these doubtless have a very small enrollment.

The large number of institutions reckoned as colleges — upwards of a hundred if we include those for women — does not import that a very high percentage

¹ Dorchester, *History of Christianity in the United States*, p. 558.

of Roman Catholics are candidates for a liberal education. Most of these institutions have preparatory departments, and the aggregate number of their students looking to the degree of A. B. is only a few thousands. The curriculum too in many of them is none too ample. To meet the confessed lack in the higher range of learning, a university has been started at Washington, the corner-stone of the divinity building having been laid in 1888. A papal brief of the next year indicated an intent at headquarters to guard the new institution from being unduly Americanized, and to secure its close relation with the Vatican. "We desire," says the Pope, "and first of all in the field of philosophy and theology, the plan of studies or programme of subjects to be followed in your university to be submitted for recognition to this apostolic see, in order that they may be approved and that the teaching in every branch of knowledge may be so arranged that your clerics and laymen equally may have an opportunity to satisfy the noble desire of knowledge by adequate instruction. But amongst these courses we wish that there be established a school of pontifical and ecclesiastical law, which knowledge, especially in these times, we know to be of great importance."¹ The chancellorship of the university was adjudged in the same brief to the Archbishop of Baltimore and his successors.

The aggressive energy which the Roman Catholic Church began to exhibit toward the middle of the century, the incoming of vast throngs of people who had been trained in that Church, and the contrariety of

¹ Quoted by J. T. Reily, *Passing Events in the Life of Cardinal Gibbons*, p. 290.

their principles to those which had hitherto dominated American society caused much excitement. Out of this sprang the Native American movement about 1844, and the Know-Nothing party ten years later. The feeling which was at the basis of these short-lived uprisings cannot be unqualifiedly reprobated, unless our soberest statesmen in the present are blameworthy for urging such restrictions upon immigration as shall prevent its outrunning the power of assimilation possessed by the nation. But, unhappily, the apprehension of danger was allowed to generate an unseemly animosity, to precipitate doubtful measures, and to afford a pretext for lawless outbreaks to the unruly element in the populace. To the distress of all fair-minded citizens and the lasting regret of all true friends of Protestantism, some scenes of mob violence occurred and several churches and convents were destroyed. Foreign refugees who had imbibed a mortal hatred of clerical domination, have been credited by Roman Catholic writers with an important part in the inception of the movement.¹

Recently among Roman Catholics themselves something of an antagonism between a native and a foreign interest has appeared. Some of the most open-eyed and alert of the prelates, such as Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, do not relish the tendency to conserve foreign badges which characterizes a part of the Romish constituency. A protest against this tendency may be discerned in the following words of Archbishop Ireland at the centennial celebration in 1889: "The Church of America must be, of course, as Catholic as even in Jerusalem or Rome, but so far as her garments

¹ J. A. Russell, in Memorial Volume of the Third Plenary Council.

assume color from the local atmosphere, she must be American. Let no one dare paint her brow with foreign tint, or pin to her mantle foreign linings. There is danger; we receive large accessions of Catholics from foreign countries. God witnesses it, they are welcome. I will not intrude upon their personal affections and tastes, but those, if foreign, they shall not incrust upon the Church. Americans have no longing for a church with foreign aspect; it would wield no influence over them.”¹ Concurring with the sentiment thus expressed by Bishop Ireland, the lay Congress, which began its session the next day, declared its conviction that societies connected with the Church should avoid any special consideration of nation or race. On the other hand, a Jesuit, who has labored for a number of years among the French Canadians of New England, contends, with the approbation of Cardinal Taschereau of Quebec, that the French language and customs are necessary safeguards to the faith of Roman Catholic immigrants from Canada, and must therefore be most industriously and perseveringly maintained. Referring to the Baltimore Congress he stigmatizes its judgment as an American ukase, and quotes also a French journal published in New England which speaks in very bitter terms of the Congress as rivalling the rabid Americanism of the Know-Nothings.²

A question provoking much agitation within the Roman Catholic body, for a considerable interval, was that relating to the tenure of church property. The plan of lay trustees which had some currency seemed

¹ Reily, *Passing Events*, p. 121.

² E. Hamon, *Les Canadiens-Français de la Nouvelle Angleterre*, 1891.

to the prelates a fatal obstruction to ecclesiastical authority. In several of the dioceses the subject gave rise to a vigorous contest. It required much effort to quell the lay trustees in Philadelphia. In New York Bishop Hughes, one of the ablest men in point of practical generalship that the Roman Catholic Church in the United States has ever had, pressed with vigor and success for placing the monopoly of church property in his own hands. Meanwhile concerted action was taken by the prelates. The First Provincial Council of Baltimore, in 1829, ordered bishops to refuse to consecrate churches except on condition of having the deed of the property duly executed to themselves. The Fourth Provincial Council, held in 1840, also prescribed that the bishop should have control of the religious property in his diocese, though permitting educational institutions to be held by corporations granted by the States.

While the controversy over lay trusteeship was in progress, an agitation of deeper consequence was begun, owing to the jealousy and opposition which were felt on the part of priests and prelates toward the public-school system of the country. Fostered by utterances of the Pope and the Congregation of the Propaganda at Rome, the opposition increased until it became apparent that no concessions as respects the management of the public schools, no policy of excluding the Bible and all text-books not agreeable to Roman Catholic feeling, could satisfy the hierarchy.

As early as 1829 the First Provincial Council of Baltimore recommended the establishment of parochial schools. The First Plenary Council, which met at Baltimore in 1852, repeated the recommendation. The

Second Plenary Council, convened in 1866, took action which implied that lack of adequate means alone could excuse any parish from providing a school. At the Third Plenary Council, in 1884, this decision was reinforced.

The ground of this policy of a total withdrawal from the public schools was thus expressed by the Second Plenary Council. "Daily experience proves sufficiently and more than sufficiently how serious are the evils, how intrinsic are the perils which our Catholic youth for the most part encounter by attendance at the public schools in these regions. By force of the system obtaining in them, it is inevitable that Catholic youths should be brought into great hazard both as respects faith and morals. Nor from any other cause does it seem necessary to derive the vast progress which that deadly disease of indifferentism, as it is called, has had in this region, and has from day to day; also that corruption of morals which we see, not without tears, infecting and destroying here and there even the most tender age in our midst." Before publishing this strong impeachment, the assembled fathers should have obtained some reasonable pledge that the parochial schools would be able to make saints of their pupils, or at least that they would be competent to lead them as far toward a broad-minded and righteous manhood as the condemned public schools. But severe as are their words of censure, they are modest compared with some of the denunciations which have been poured forth. Archbishop Hughes wrote in 1858: "The public-school system is a disgrace to the civilization of the nineteenth century; I hope to see the day when New York will

look back upon it with shame and horror, that such a gross and miserable delusion should ever have been suffered to take possession of the public mind." The "Freeman's Journal" for Dec. 11, 1869, blurted out its judgment in these words: "Let the public school system go to where it came from — the devil." A liberal Roman Catholic, who seems to have had ample opportunities for information, has remarked recently: "The school question was one of the bitterest in agitation that was ever discussed in the Catholic press. The godless schools were inveighed against and denounced without quarter. . . . We have heard priests preach against the godless schools until they had to be silenced to save them from the asylum."¹

The initiative in the whole crusade was with the American hierarchy, or, farther back, with the Pope and with the Roman Congregation upon which the Church in this country has been more immediately dependent. To a large extent the laity were not dissatisfied with the public schools. But as they form no part of the governing body in the Romish communion, their preference can count for nothing, unless backed up by a determination which threatens to issue in a formidable rebellion. In more than one instance parents have been told that they must send their children to the parochial school under pain of forfeiting the sacraments. A casuistical treatise published in Latin, in 1874, and sufficiently representative to be heartily endorsed by a considerable list of bishops, renders these conclusions: "Universally parents cannot be absolved who confide their children to public schools, respecting which they

¹ Reily, *Passing Events*, p. 394.

do not know whether they are in the number of the positively injurious or not. . . . Unless they can otherwise provide sufficiently for the Catholic instruction of their children, parents cannot be absolved who commit their instruction to the public schools, although not certainly of a positively injurious kind, in those places and connections in which they can commit them to some Catholic school. . . . Parents cannot be absolved, who, without a cause proportionately grave, commit their children to any public school, although not positively injurious, in those connections in which that cannot be done without serious scandal. Suppose for example, a Catholic man who is conspicuous among his fellow citizens for wealth, authority, or any other cause, in whose parish a Catholic school coexists with a public one. If this person by his example, especially if, as is likely to happen in such instances, he should by his encomiums induce others to enter the public school, to the deserting of the Catholic school or non-attendance therein, he would assuredly be guilty of a great scandal, and consequently ought not to be absolved." In summing up, the writer says: "Respect being had to conditions of times and places, public schools, and in general all schools in which there prevails that method of instructing the youth which is severed from the Catholic faith and the authority of the Church, are commonly to be regarded as positively injurious, and therefore *as a rule* absolution is to be refused to parents who commit their children to the instruction of the same; by *way of exception* only is it to be conceded, that is, only in those cases in which the precept to educate offspring in a Catholic manner is kept so far as it is affir-

mative, to the extent of the ability, and is not violated so far as it is *negative.*" The authorities most frequently appealed to in deducing these conclusions are the Syllabus published by Pius IX. in 1864, and the letter of the same pontiff to the Archbishop of Freiburg.¹

The Third Plenary Council (1884) thought it necessary to caution bishops and priests against an indiscreet zeal in withholding the sacraments from the patrons of the public schools. But, on the other hand, it plainly committed the Roman Catholic Church to the policy of erecting everywhere, as soon as practicable, parochial schools, and of gathering the whole body of its children into them.²

¹ Professor A. Konings, *De Absolutione Parentibus, etc.*, 1874.

² The council cited this instruction from the Congregation of the Propaganda, given in 1875 : "It is fitting that those who are intrusted with the oversight of sacred things should, by every available means and effort, guard the flock committed to themselves from all contagion of the public schools. But to this end, it is commonly agreed, nothing is so necessary as that Catholics should have in all places schools of their own, and these not inferior to the public schools. Wherefore all care and foresight should be taken either to found Catholic schools where they are wanting, or to enlarge them, and to order and equip them more perfectly, so that in instruction and discipline they may equal the public schools." It quotes also from the encyclical letter of Leo XIII. to the French bishops, February, 8, 1884, wherein the Pope declares the hostility of the Church to schools not under ecclesiastical direction. (*Ecclesia semper scholas quas appellant mixtas vel neutras aperte damnavit.*) In harmony with these references to the papal letter and the instruction of the Congregation of the Propaganda, the council decreed : 1. "That near every church, where a parochial school does not yet exist, one shall be erected within two years from the promulgation of this council, and be sustained in perpetuity, unless the bishop judges that delay ought to be conceded on account of difficulties of the graver sort. 2. That the priest who within this time impedes by his serious negligence the erection or support of a school, or does not give

The fencing off of Roman Catholic children into parochial schools is only half of the programme as prepared several decades since by the hierarchy. The other half is the urging of the demand that these schools should be supported from the public treasury. At least there has been a sufficient number of declarations to beget the suspicion that nothing but the apprehension of arousing sharp and harmful antagonisms has prevented the prelates from unitedly pushing this demand.¹ The ground urged for public support is the alleged unfairness of levying taxes upon Roman Catholics for a school fund in which they have no share.

Protestants, on their side, claim quite generally that Roman Catholics have only themselves to blame for their extra burdens, and cannot reasonably require the Commonwealth to bless and foster their private enterprise to its own hazard and injury. They maintain that an offer to support one set of denominational schools would be placing a premium on sectarian exclusiveness and bigotry wherever found in the country; that such an offer

heed after repeated admonitions by the bishop, deserves to be removed from that church. 3. That the mission or parish which so neglects to assist the priest in erecting and sustaining a school, that on account of its supine negligence the school cannot exist, should be reprehended by the bishop, and be induced by any more efficacious and prudent means at his command to confer the necessary aids. 4. That Catholic parents are bound to send their offspring to parochial schools, unless they provide sufficiently and evidently either at home or in other Catholic schools for the Christian education of their children, or for a sufficient reason, approved by the bishop, and with suitable cautions and remedies, they are allowed to send them to other schools." (Acta et Decreta, pp. 98-104, 279-282.)

¹ Very recently (January, 1894) the fact has been elicited that there is a division of opinion among the bishops on the propriety of pressing the demand for a share in the public funds.

would accordingly be likely to invite new demands for a division of funds, until finally the prestige of the public-school system would be overthrown, and the system end in a relative if not a complete wreck. They emphasize the idea that in a nation of such mixed ingredients as this, it is vastly important to have a potent unifying agency, and means of contact between all classes, like that provided in the public schools. In enforcing this idea they can appeal to utterances of Roman Catholics themselves. Thus Cardinal Gibbons tells us that "the multiplicity of sects in this country, with their mutual reriminations, is the scandal of Christianity;" and Bishop J. L. Spalding assures us that sectarian divisions are dangerous to the unity of the republic, since they have a "tendency to prepare the public mind to contemplate without alarm or indignation like divisions and dissensions in the State." Why, then, it is appropriately asked, remove the most effectual instrumentality for ameliorating sectarian prejudice and fostering community of sentiments? Will it tend to promote friendly feeling between Roman Catholics and Protestants, or between one body of Protestants and another, to run a dividing wall between them from infancy? Already there are incitements to sharp antagonisms. A certain grade of ill-informed Protestants has shown itself ready to rush into exaggerated suspicion and accusation respecting Roman Catholic intentions and doings. On the other hand, Roman Catholics have made a free use of the language of invective in characterizing Protestantism. Roman Catholic youth have been taught in a catechism, published under high sanction, that there is no saving faith in Protestantism, and that the founders of

Protestant communions, were wicked men who taught impious doctrines.¹ They have also had an opportunity to read these lines voiced by a bishop in the national assembly of his Church: "Originating in insubordination to the established and recognized authority of God, without doctrine or sacraments, without men or means to make any one or anything holy, without divine faith, or the virtues that spring from it, or any element of the supernatural life, without the blessing of God or any testimony of his favor, Protestantism as a religion is a barren fig-tree; it bears no fruit of life, it never will bear any."² With a like exhibition of charity Protestant churches have been characterized by representative writers as "synagogues of Satan." Surely no divisive agency, no expedient for aggravating sectarian differences is needed. A sober view of the facts emphasizes rather the declaration of Father McGlynn: "National common-schools are indispensable to a common nationality."

Beyond these main considerations there is the practical question, whether a piecemeal division of public-school funds can be accomplished without bickerings, disputings, and overreachings. Not a few people are perfectly assured in their minds that a Church which claims sole legitimacy, and regards itself as identical with the kingdom of God on earth will always think itself entitled to the lion's share. Millions of dollars

¹ Catechism of Christian Doctrine for Parochial and Sunday Schools, with the approbation of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, and certified by Archbishop Bailey of Baltimore, September 24, 1874, — No. ii., improved edition.

² Memorial Volume of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, pp. 239, 240.

sought and secured by Roman Catholics for denominational uses in New York City do not help to create confidence as to moderation in future demands. In truth, if moderation had ruled, a hierarchy three fourths of whose members were born out of the country would have been less ready to denounce a system of education which satisfies nine tenths of the people, and in its essential characteristics gives no valid ground of dissatisfaction to the rest.

Very recently the diplomacy of Leo XIII. has put somewhat of a check upon open revilement and condemnation of the public schools. Being apprised of the serious and growing antagonism, noted above, between an American and a foreign party in the Roman Catholic Church of this country, he sent in the fall of 1892 Mgr. Satolli, to act as his delegate in composing differences and bringing about unity of feeling and action. The outcome of Mgr. Satolli's mission is not yet (1894) fully determined; but he seems to have been convinced that the party favoring some accommodation to American sentiments has shown the better discretion, and that a brusque hostility to the public schools must act to the prejudice of Roman Catholic interests. Accordingly he has expressed himself (though in guarded terms) in a somewhat more tolerant manner respecting attendance at the public schools than that which many priests and prelates have employed. Those, however, who view the papacy in the whole scope of its administration, will build no large expectations on the seeming concession of a papal agent to American institutions. The dictate of policy is one thing; conviction and ultimate aim are quite different things. Doubtless the less hostile tone,

if persisted in, will be favorable in some respects to Roman Catholic interests; but, on the other hand, it is likely to involve a forfeit in so far as it promotes in the Roman Catholic constituency the notion that Protestantism, after all, is not unalloyed evil,—not another name for contaminating license and irreligion. As to persistence in the relatively conciliatory policy, there is of course but an uncertain guarantee, since the temperature of the Vatican is subject to changes, and Roman weather has a speedy effect upon the bearing and action of the American prelates.

In the dogmatic range the action of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States has very little significance. Since the decisions of its councils must be sent to Rome for confirmation and revision before they can be published, they must in the nature of the case be conformable to the papal programme, and are not necessarily exactly representative of the mind of the episcopal body, except as it is the mind of that body to follow the dictation of Rome. Accordingly, though the councils are recorded to have abetted the dogmatic schemes of Pius IX. up to the time of the Vatican Assembly, it was found at that assembly that the declaration of infallibility was very unwelcome to a considerable fraction of the bishops. In January, 1870, twenty-four bishops from the United States and Canada signed a petition to the Pope urging him not to introduce the definition of infallibility to the council. Only about two fifths of these, it is true, gave a decided negative when the question came to a vote. But the earlier expression shows the practical, if not also the theoretical, aversion which they felt toward the project

of dogmatic absolutism. Among the more eminent representatives of the episcopate in the United States, Spalding of Baltimore began with a qualified approval and ended with a zealous advocacy of the definition of infallibility. On the other hand, Kenrick of St. Louis and Purcell of Cincinnati opposed it uncompromisingly till its promulgation left no alternatives but submission or excommunication. Both of these prelates indicated with sufficient distinctness that they questioned, not merely the opportuneness of declaring infallibility, but the dogma itself. Kenrick, in an address printed at the time of the council, argued cogently against the alleged supports of the dogma in the Scriptures, as being sustained neither by the natural sense of the Gospel passages nor by the interpretations of the fathers.¹ Purcell in a letter to the Bishop of Orleans declared in behalf of the American prelates: "Several of us believe that ecclesiastical history, the history of the Popes, the history of the councils, and the tradition of the Church, are not in harmony with the new dogma; and it is for this that we believe that it is very inopportune to wish to define, as of faith, an opinion that appears to us a novelty in the faith, that seems to us to be without solid foundation in Scripture and tradition; which, it appears to us, is contradicted by irrefragable monuments."²

Roman Catholic apology, as developed in this country, falls mainly under the category of *rhetorical dogmatism*. It circulates in general about two propositions, namely, the Roman Catholic Church is not so bad as repre-

¹ *Concio Habenda at non Habita.*

² R. H. Clarke, *Lives of the Deceased Bishops*, iii. 223, 224.

sented, and convenience is the test of truth. The latter of course is not formulated in these terms; but they express precisely the underlying assumption of the argumentation which leaps to the conclusion that there is an infallible Church upon earth, and that the Romish Church, by reason of its numbers, historical continuity, and constant claim must be that one. In dealing with the former proposition the apologists have had a measure of success, an advantage having sometimes been given them by the too sweeping assertions of their opponents. But they have brought out extreme against extreme, and justly exposed themselves to the charge of whitewashing many dark events of history. As to proving the infallibility of the Romish Church, they have not yet offered the first instalment of a real evidence, since history gives no warrant for the supposition that convenience is the test of truth. In the light of its record one could far more reasonably deny infallibility to the Church triumphant in heaven than impute it to an earthly organization with its full catalogue of sins, corruptions, ignorances, tyrannies, and self-contradictions.

In this line of rhetorical dogmatism the convert Orestes A. Brownson — who landed in the Roman Catholic Church after sailing through Presbyterianism, Universalism, Unitarianism, agnosticism, socialism, and eclecticism — has played a rôle second to none. Proving facts by ideals, or what he takes to be ideals, identifying the Romish Church unqualifiedly with the supernatural order, casting Protestants out of court as having no right to judge the Church since they belong to the realm of sheer naturalism, he of course

makes easy work with his opponents and moves onward with a triumphant air. Difficulties which have been troublesome to many Roman Catholic writers in no wise disturb this American Joseph de Maistre. For example, he finds in the history of the papacy no trace of usurped authority or unrighteous arrogance. "All the power," he says, "that it can be proved the Pope ever claimed, as representative of the spiritual order, in temporals, was actually defined to be of faith by Boniface VIII. in the bull *Unam Sanctam*, which has never been and never can be abrogated, if we may believe Clement V., who, when Philip the Fair demanded its recall, answered that he could not recall it because it contained a dogmatic definition."¹ The exercise of this power, he claims, has always been managed with righteousness and discretion. "We grant," he writes, "that the Pope has excommunicated princes and nobles, deposed kings and emperors, and absolved their subjects from their allegiance; but in this he has only done his duty as the spiritual father of Christendom, and what was required by humanity as well as by religion."² The State, he assumes, belongs completely to the sphere of subjection and service. "To deny the supremacy of the Church in temporals is only to release the temporal order from its subjection to divine sovereignty. . . . The State is only the inferior court, bound to receive the law from the supreme court, and liable to have its decisions reversed on appeal."³

In picturing the character and destiny of Protestants, Brownson ranks them as obdurate culprits rather than

¹ Brownson's Review, April, 1856.

² Essays and Reviews, p. 203.

³ Ibid pp. 283, 284.

errorists, and consigns them *en masse* to hell. These are his words : “ Finding the essence of Protestantism to be mere vulgar pride, that is, a moral disease rather than an intellectual aberration, it is evident that we are to treat it as a vice rather than as an error, and Protestants as sinners rather than as simply unbelievers or misbelievers. This may not be very flattering to their pride ; nevertheless, it is the only way they deserve to be treated, and the only way in which they can be treated for their good. We honor them quite too much when we treat them as men whose heads are wrong, but whose hearts are sound. The wrongness of the head is the consequence of the rottenness of the heart. They are worldly, and their wisdom is earthly, sensual, devilish ; even their virtues, their honesty, their uprightness of conduct have reference, not to God, but to their justification, either in the eyes of the world or in the eyes of their own pride.”¹ “ To us there is something shocking in the supposition that the dogma *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* — ‘ out of the Church no salvation ’ — is only *generally* true, and therefore not a Catholic dogma. All Catholic dogmas, if Catholic, are not only generally but universally true, and admit no exception or

¹ Essays and Reviews, pp. 259–262. The words of another Roman Catholic may well be compared with those of Brownson. “ As a child,” says J. T. Reily, “ we grew up regarding Protestants as people unfit for our association, — something mysterious and abhorrent about them never explained quite by our parents and teachers. We looked at their meeting-house with fear and horror. Our God was to us the only God in existence. It could not be that He was the God of the Protestants — never ! But as age and intercourse came on we found them better than ourselves, often giving us examples of gentleness and reproof, and especially of forbearance and sincerity that shamed our false impressions away.”

restriction whatever. If men can come to Christ and be saved without the Church, or union with Christ in the Church, she is not Catholic, and it is false to call her the one Holy Catholic Church, as in the Creed. . . . We do not dare to say that when a Protestant dies he is assuredly lost, for we know not what passed between God and his soul at the last moment before the breath left the body ; but this we do dare to say, that, if one dies a Protestant,—and the presumption, if he remains an adhering Protestant up to the last moment, is that he does so die,—he is most assuredly damned, that is, forever deprived of heaven, and will never see God as he is.”¹ In the same connection, following the Council of Florence, Brownson accepts the conclusion that unbaptized infants go to hell, and adds the conviction that they endure a measure of positive suffering as failing of their proper destiny. In fine, he compounds a creed which ought to satisfy any zealot for damnation who is not over-hard to please.

It is of interest to note that the greatest of American converts has been disposed to criticise the greatest of English converts. In the view of Brownson, Newman, who was in fact hampered to some extent by his knowledge of history, did not rise to the full height of a truly Catholic consciousness. He was inclined to rate him as a kind of half-Anglican in his way of thinking. Objecting to the tone of his reply to Gladstone, he said : “ A friend in whose judgment we place great confidence remarks to us that Dr. Newman does not appear to write in a thoroughly Catholic spirit.”² At an earlier date he had entered a vigorous protest against the theory

¹ Brownson’s Review, April, 1874.

² Ibid. April, 1875.

of dogmatic development through which the Tractarian leader had argued himself into the Roman Catholic faith. "Mr. Newman," he wrote in 1846, "maintains a slow, painful, and laborious working out, by the Church herself, of dogmatic truth from implicit feelings. . . . She had a blind instinct, which, under secret, supernatural guidance, enabled her to avoid error and to pursue the regular course of development. She had a secret feeling of the truth, as one may say, a natural taste for it, and a distaste for error; yet not that clear and distinct understanding which would have enabled her at any moment, on any given point, to define her faith. She only knew enough of truth to preserve the original idea, and to elaborate from her intense feelings, slowly and painfully, as time went on, now one dogma and now another. What in one age is feeling, in a succeeding age becomes opinion, and an article of faith in a still later age. . . . We ask, Does the Church herself take this view? Does she admit her original creed was incomplete, that it has increased and expanded, that there have been variation and progress in her understanding of the revelation she originally received, and that she now understands it better—can more readily define what it is than she could at first? Most assuredly not. She asserts that there has been no progress, no increase, no variation of faith; that what she believes and teaches now is precisely what she has always and everywhere believed and taught from the first. She denies that she has ever added a new article to the primitive creed."¹ As to a choice between these contra-

¹ Brownson's Review, July, 1846. The order of the passages is changed in the quotation, but without affecting the author's line of argument.

dictory views the Romanist may well find some ground of perplexity. The view of Brownson is undoubtedly conformable to the general language of councils and Popes; but it is so grossly unhistoric that it is not strange that some Roman Catholic theologians have thought it advisable to make very considerable approaches to Newman's theory of dogmatic development.

10. MORMONS.—A theocracy which can boast no such prestige of numbers and historical associations as belongs to that centring in Rome, but which claims equally a right to subordinate all men and institutions to itself, was founded in 1830 at Fayette in the State of New York; had its headquarters at Kirtland, Ohio, between 1831 and 1838; was represented at the same date by a band of colonists in Missouri; was intrenched at Nauvoo, Illinois, from 1839 to 1846–47; from this time has built up its priestly kingdom in Utah and the neighboring territories; and has won a greater or less number of adherents in many foreign countries.

The primary credential of this nineteenth century theocracy — which is called by its adherents the “Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints,” and is commonly described by outsiders as the “Mormon Church” — was the Book of Mormon. Joseph Smith claimed to have ascertained the location of the hidden treasure, under divine direction, in 1823, and to have taken it into his possession in 1827. This Occidental Bible, or story of religion in pre-historic America, purporting to have been written many centuries ago on metallic plates in Reformed Egyptian, was translated, it was alleged, by the use of a kind of magical spectacles, composed of a

pair of stones set in rims of steel. Of course, no one besides a few intimates of the prophet Joseph even had so much as a glance at the original of the Book of Mormon, and it was conveniently placed beyond the reach of any critical examination by being withdrawn into the hands of the angel who acted as its guardian. According to a very general opinion, the real original was a religious romance left in manuscript by Solomon Spaulding, and brought to the knowledge of Joseph Smith by his confederate Sidney Rigdon. In any case the fraudulent character of the claim to antiquity is sufficiently transparent. To say nothing about the preposterous magic involved in the ability of a pair of huge stone spectacles to render an Oriental tongue into English, the obvious dependence of the writing upon the King James' version of the Bible shows unmistakably its modern origin, while the grammatical blunders which it contained, as printed in 1830, indicate clearly that some part of it at least came from no higher source than the illiterate agent of the pretended discovery,—unless perchance the spectacles had some flaw which disqualifed them from uniformly refracting Egyptian into good English.

Having successfully duped a number of people with his fraudulent Bible, Smith went forward boldly as the head of a new dispensation, and claimed to be the channel of repeated revelations. How high a flight his confidence had taken shortly before his assassination in 1844, may be seen in the fact that he had himself proposed as a candidate for the presidency of the United States, and published the principles upon which he proposed to administer the high office.

If other leaders of the Mormons have not imitated their first prophet in openly aspiring to the headship of the nation, they have not failed to indicate their belief that the right to universal rule belongs to themselves, as holding the sceptre of the true theocracy upon earth. Brigham Young, who fulfilled the part of a second founder by leading the Mormons to Utah, declared : “Our ecclesiastical government is the government of heaven, and includes all governments in earth and hell. It is the fountain, the mainspring, the source of all light, power, and government that ever did or ever will exist. It circumscribes the governments of this world. . . . There is no true government on earth but the government of God or the holy priesthood.”¹ To similar effect are the words of Orson Pratt: “It is not consistent that the people of God should organize or be subject to man-made governments. If it were so, they could never be perfected. There can be but one perfect government,—that organized by God, a government by apostles, prophets, priests, teachers, and evangelists; the order of the original church of all churches acknowledged by God.”² The place of the Mormon president in this government is thus defined by Jedediah M. Grant: “Mormonism is *one*, it is governed by one head, one president, and that head representing God on earth. If Joseph Smith held the keys of the kingdom of God on earth, of the apostleship, does not his successor possess the same ?”³

¹ Journal of Discourses, vii. 112, quoted by Lyford, The Mormon Problem.

² Quoted by Bancroft, History of the Pacific States of North America, xxi. 368, 369.

³ Journal of Discourses, ii. 15.

The practice of the Mormons has corresponded with this theory. They have been distinguished by an extraordinary political solidarity. Wherever any interest of their Church has been involved, or appeared to be involved, all else has been ignored. The voice of the priesthood has always virtually silenced that of the civil government in the ears of the Saints. Thus they have shown an inveterate tendency to constitute an *imperium in imperio*, an independent sovereignty within the nation. From this unhappy singularity, supplemented by a free venting of very arrogant claims and anticipations, sprang in large part the hostility which drove them out of Missouri and Illinois, and the dislike which has continued to be entertained against them by their non-Mormon neighbors. It is felt that a theocratic system which makes subserviency to a priestly hierarchy to completely overshadow all other claims is antagonistic to the obligations of citizenship, an alien factor in the republic, a pestiferous thing to manage.

If theocratic pretension, sustained by a very thorough and pervasive system of official supervision, has been the leading feature of Mormonism, the doctrine and practice of plural marriage must be placed next to this. According to the orthodox Mormon theory the revelation in behalf of plural marriage, though not published till 1852, was received by Joseph Smith in 1843. On the other hand, the non-polygamous Mormons¹ deny that any such revelation was given. If the main body of Mormons is right in assuming that the document which purports to be a divine sanction of polygamy dates from

¹ These style themselves the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. At the census of 1890 they numbered 21,773.

1843, then Joseph Smith was guilty of barefaced deception; for in a notice published in the "Times and Seasons" of February 1, 1844, he numbered polygamy among "false and corrupt doctrines." On the same supposition he was also guilty of flagrant self-contradiction; since there are passages in the Book of Mormon and in the Book of Covenants which plainly disown polygamy. If, on the contrary, he made no pretence to having received the revelation in question, the lie rests with the Mormon chiefs who followed. Doubtless either party could have carried off the falsehood without change of countenance; but the early initiation of polygamous practice, and the fact that several women in Utah have claimed to have been wives of the deceased prophet, make it highly probable that Joseph Smith sanctioned the odious practice in the inner circle of Mormonism, while reprobating it before the public.

In the Mormon scheme plural marriage holds not merely the rank of a permissible social arrangement, but has a far-reaching importance as being vitally related to the future destiny of men. It hastens, it is claimed, the embodiment of pre-existent spirits, by increasing the number of births within a given time, and thereby forwards the development of spirits into [Mormon] saints, and so into heirs of immortal blessedness. Moreover, exaltation in the life to come is made to depend on the extent of a man's family establishment, or the number of his wives and children. In a discourse delivered July 14, 1855, Brigham Young said: "If I be made the king and lawgiver to my family, and if I have many sons, I shall become the father of many fathers, for they will have sons, and so on, from generation to

generation ; and in this way I may become the father of many fathers, or the king of many kings. In this way we can become King of kings, and Lord of lords, or Father of fathers, or Prince of princes ; and this is the only course, for another man is not going to raise up a kingdom for you.”¹ The imperative nature of this item of Mormon teaching was declared at the same time in these strong terms : “ Now if any of you will deny the plurality of wives, and continue to do so, I promise that you will be damned ; and I will go still further and say, take this revelation, or any other revelation that the Lord has given, and deny it in your feelings, and I promise that you will be damned.”

Marriage may be exclusively for time, or exclusively for eternity, or possibly for both time and eternity. The second type, which is described as spiritual marriage, provides for a mixed sense of proprietorship, since it enables a man to become the prospective husband of another man’s wife by the simple process of having her sealed to him for eternity. That this mixed sense of proprietorship is favorable to connubial fidelity, no one can believe who seriously ponders the conditions.

While thus an ambition for multiplied marriage relations has been promoted, facility of divorce has not been neglected. “ Brigham, as head of the Church, claimed authority not only to marry, but also to divorce at will. . . . In a district removed from the capital, only the consent of the bishop is necessary, and the bill of divorcement is a very simple writing.”²

It can hardly be regarded as an accident that the very conception of Deity is made conformable in the

¹ Journal of Discourses, iii. 266.

² Bancroft, xxi. 355.

Mormon scheme to the doctrine of polygamy. God the Father is declared by Smith and Young to have a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's,¹ and in Mormon thought it is counted no derogation from His honor to assign to Him veritable connubial relations. Christ is asserted to have lived upon earth as a polygamist. In a sermon, of October 6, 1854, Orson Hyde said: "I do not despise to be called a son of Abraham, if he had a dozen wives; or to be called a brother, a son, a child of the Saviour, if he had Martha and Mary and several others as wives; and though he did cast seven devils out of one of them, it is all the same to me."² Not infrequently a suggestion is given that, inasmuch as kingly dominion depends on extent of progeny, God is only relatively distinguished from men. In fact, a polytheistic phraseology is freely employed. Thus we have this from Brigham Young: "The Lord created you and me for the purpose of becoming Gods like Himself. . . . We are created, we are born for the express purpose of growing up from the low estate of manhood to become Gods like unto our Father in heaven."³ On another occasion, if he has been correctly reported, Brigham went so far as to say of Adam, "He is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do."⁴

At one time the doctrine of blood atonement was industriously proclaimed among the Mormons. Its im-

¹ Compendium of Faith and Doctrines, compiled by F. D. Richards, pp. 146, 152.

² Journal of Discourses, ii. 82.

³ Journal of Discourses, iii. 93.

⁴ Tabernacle Sermon, April 9, 1852, quoted by Stenhouse, Rocky Mountain Saints, p. 485.

port may be seen from the following words of Brigham Young: "There are sins which men commit for which they cannot receive forgiveness in this world or in that which is to come; and if they had their eyes open to their true condition they would be perfectly willing to have their blood spilt upon the ground, that the smoke thereof might ascend to heaven as an offering for their sins; and the smoking incense would atone for their sins."¹ Whatever extenuating explanations may have been offered recently, this doctrine of blood atonement evidently meant, as propounded, vastly more than a simple preference of the axe or the knife over the halter as an instrument for executing condemned criminals. It meant the cutting off of men for such offences as might be grievous in the sight of theocratic sovereignty, and not merely for acts ordinarily reckoned as capital crimes. The following language of Brigham Young is sufficiently intelligible: "The ignorance and wickedness of the nations forbid this principle being in full force, but the time will come when the law of God will be in full force. This is loving our neighbor as ourselves. If he needs help, help him; if he wants salvation, and it is necessary to spill his blood on the earth in order that he may be saved, spill it."² In this connection the question naturally arises, how far the murders committed in Utah have been dictated by a motive of such high benevolence.

Reinforced in numbers and confidence by accessions secured through the proselyting efforts of a great corps of missionaries, and consolidated by its theocratic organ-

¹ Quoted by Stenhouse, *Rocky Mountain Saints*, p. 304.

² *Journal of Discourses*, iv. 219, 220, quoted by Stenhouse, p. 299.

ization, the Mormon Church has presented a stubborn resistance to attempts to mitigate its obnoxious features. Though Congress in 1862 declared polygamy punishable as a crime, nothing was accomplished toward abating the scandal till the passage of the Edmunds bill in 1882; and the efficiency of this measure to extirpate the deeply rooted evil must be regarded as somewhat problematical until the sincerity of recent professions on the part of the Mormons has been thoroughly tested.

11. SOCIALISTIC COMMUNITIES.—The great era of socialistic experiments in this country was the second quarter of the century. Eleven communities were started on the Owenite plan, soon after the arrival of Robert Owen in this country in 1824, and thirty-four approximating to the less communistic model of Fourier were instituted in the ten or fifteen years following 1840. Most of these were ephemeral. But a number of communities have been formed, chiefly through foreign instrumentality, which have exhibited a good measure of persistence. The Shakers, founded by Ann Lee, have existed in the United States since 1774, and have exemplified the communistic feature since 1787. The Harmonists in Pennsylvania, who imitate the Shakers in the practice of celibacy and communism, came from Germany in the early part of the century, under the leadership of George Rapp. The community at Zoar in Ohio dates from about 1817. Its founder, Joseph Bimeler, was a German. It allows marriage. The Amana Society of family communists, in Iowa, originated in Germany in 1820, was established near Buffalo in 1842, and migrated thence to Iowa in 1855. In 1842 Eric Janson,

a Swede, started a community at Bishop Hill, Illinois, in which the celibate régime was favored. The community of Oneida Perfectionists in New York State, dating from 1847, attempted to extend the communistic principle to person as well as to property. Industrially it has been successful; but its free-love doctrines were necessarily regarded as intolerable; its leader, J. H. Noyes, found it convenient to retire to Canada. The principle of marriage proper was adopted in 1879; and in 1881 the society became an ordinary joint-stock concern.⁷

Most of the Owenite and Fourierite communities were without a definite religious basis. Two of them, the Yellow Springs community and the Leraysville Phalanx, were dominated by the Swedenborgian faith; and the more recent community at Brocton, New York, started with a strong infusion of the same faith. Brook Farm, which for an interval was a centre of Fourierite propaganda, represented Unitarian transcendentalism.

The collapse of the great majority of the socialistic communities seems to have favored the progress of modern spiritism. At any rate, some turned to this novelty as a solace in the midst of their broken anticipations. Robert Owen himself accepted the reality of communications with spirits, and his son, Robert Dale Owen, became a leading apostle of spiritism. From that time this seductive necromancy has had no inconsiderable number of votaries, though many of the alleged marvels have been proved to be mere vulgar frauds, and the worthlessness, in the aggregate, of the supposed communications from spirits shows either that they

¹ See, on the general subject, J. H. Noyes, *History of American Socialisms*; R. T. Ely, *The Labor Movement in America*.

are fabulous, or that death means a lapse into mental imbecility as well as a dissolution of the body.

12. DENOMINATIONAL STATISTICS.—In the foregoing review very little has been given in the way of denominational statistics. We subjoin accordingly the following statement of the numerical strength of the different religious bodies, as contained in the census report for the year 1890. A correct understanding of the figures will, of course, require note of the fact that they stand for *members*, and therefore in respect of most Protestant denominations are much below the proper estimate of *adherents* in a general sense. Many of the smaller communions have been omitted.

Methodists (total of all bodies)	4,589,284
Methodist Episcopal Church	2,240,354
Methodist Episcopal, South	1,209,976
African Methodist Episcopal	452,725
African Methodist Episcopal Zion	349,788
Methodist Protestant	141,989
Colored Methodist Episcopal	129,383
Free Methodist	22,110
Baptists (total of all bodies)	3,717,969
Regular Baptist Church (Colored)	1,362,140
Regular Baptist (South)	1,276,491
Regular Baptist (North)	800,025
Primitive or Anti-Mission Baptist	94,348
Free Will Baptist	87,898
Presbyterians (total of all bodies)	1,278,332
Presbyterian Church (Northern)	788,224
Presbyterian (Southern)	179,721
Cumberland Presbyterian	164,940
United Presbyterian	94,402

Reformed Church in the United States (or German Reformed)	204,018
Reformed Church in America (or Dutch Reformed)	92,970
Lutherans (total of all bodies)	1,199,514
Synodical Conference	357,153
General Council	317,145
General Synod	164,640
United Norwegian Church of America	119,972
Joint Synod of Ohio and other States	69,505
Norwegian Church in America	55,452
United Synod in the South	37,457
Disciples of Christ	641,051
Protestant Episcopal Church	532,054
Congregational Church	512,771
United Brethren in Christ	202,474
German Evangelical Synod of North America	187,432
Evangelical Association	133,313
Christians, or Christian Connection	90,718
Friends (Orthodox)	80,655
Friends (Hicksite)	21,992
Unitarians	67,749
Brethren, or Dunkards	61,101
Universalists	49,194
German Evangelical Protestant Church of Nor. America	36,156
Seventh-Day Adventists	28,991
Advent Christian Church	25,816
Church of God (Weinbrennerian)	22,511
Mennonites	17,078
Moravians	11,781
The New Church (Swedenborgian)	7,095
Roman Catholics	6,250,045
Greek Catholics (Uniates)	10,850
Russian Orthodox Church	13,504
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (Mormons)	144,352
Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (non-polygamous Mormons)	21,773

Orthodox Jews	57,5971
Reformed Jews	72,899

III. OUTLINES OF CANADIAN CHURCH HISTORY.

When British succeeded French rule in the territories to the north of the United States the population was predominantly Roman Catholic. Of the seventy thousand in Lower and Upper Canada in 1763, only a few hundreds were Protestants. In the maritime provinces

¹ H. K. Carroll, in his valuable treatise, "The Religious Forces in the United States," based on the census of 1890, gives the following alphabetical list of religious bodies:—

- I. Adventists, six branches.
2. Baptists, thirteen branches.
3. River Brethren, three branches.
4. Plymouth Brethren, four branches.
5. Catholics, seven branches.
6. Catholic Apostolic Church (Irvingite).
7. Worshippers in Chinese Temples.
8. Christadelphians.
9. Christians.
10. Christian Missionary Association.
11. Christian Scientists.
12. Christian Union Churches.
13. Church of God.
14. Church Triumphant (Schweinfurth).
15. Church of the New Jerusalem.
16. Communistic Societies, eight varieties.
17. Congregationalists.
18. Disciples of Christ.
19. Dunkards, four branches.
20. Evangelical Association.
21. Friends, four branches.
22. Friends of the Temple.
23. German Evangelical Protestant Church.
24. German Evangelical Synod.
25. Jews, two branches.
26. Latter-day Saints, two branches.
27. Evangelical Lutherans, sixteen branches (as respects interconnection of synods).
28. Mennonites, twelve branches.
29. Methodists, seventeen branches.
30. Moravians.
31. Presbyterians, twelve branches.
32. Protestant Episcopal Church, two branches.
33. Reformed, three branches.
34. Salvation Army.
35. Schwenkfeldians.
36. Social Brethren.
37. Society for Ethical Culture.
38. Spiritualists.
39. Theosophical Society.
40. United Brethren in Christ, two branches.
41. Unitarians.
42. Universalists.

The creed of the immense majority of the Protestant population is reckoned as evangelical. Mr. Carroll estimates that the non-evangelical, the non-orthodox (including Christian Scientists, Church Triumphant, Communistic Societies, Latter-day Saints, and Spiritualists), and the non-Christian bodies number together less than half a million members.

the Protestants numbered about nine thousand, against eleven thousand Roman Catholics. It was only a few years, however, before the disproportion was considerably modified. Many thousands who took the loyalist side in the struggle of the American colonies for independence found it desirable to make their home in the British provinces. Nova Scotia and Upper Canada received large accessions from this source by the year 1784, and the Protestant element in these regions was increased in the subsequent years by European immigrants. Lower Canada remained strongly Roman Catholic, but in the Dominion as a whole Protestantism advanced to a majority.

Within the Protestant body the claim of the Church of England to a privileged position was a cause of agitation for a long interval. The special bone of contention was the so-called "Clergy Reserve." The legal ground for this was the Act of 1774, supplemented by that of 1791, the one authorizing the British sovereign to make provision "for the encouragement of the Protestant religion, and for the maintenance and support of a Protestant clergy," and the other reserving one seventh of the unceded lands of Upper and Lower Canada "for the support and maintenance of a Protestant clergy." The import of these Acts depended upon the interpretation of the expression "Protestant clergy." Champions of the Church of England, among whom John Strachan — successively Rector, Archdeacon, and Bishop of Toronto — was the most able and energetic, contended that the Clergy Reserve should be devoted exclusively to the Church of England in the Dominion. On the other hand, representatives of the Church of Scotland argued

that in British law the Scottish Church was just as truly *established* as the Anglican, and that consequently the ministers of the former had no less a title than the latter to be included within the legal sense of the term "Protestant clergy." A third party, composed largely of Presbyterian Dissenters and Methodists, claimed that the Protestant interest in general should have the benefit of the Reserve. This position was favored by a majority of the Protestants in the Dominion; but the government was inclined to uphold the exclusive claims of the Church of England, though it could not find any clear ground for excluding the Church of Scotland. After years of discussion, petitions, and counter-petitions, a compromise was attempted in 1840 on the basis of granting limited allowances to other Churches, and assigning two thirds of the remaining proceeds from the sale of Clergy Reserve lands to the Church of England and one third to the Church of Scotland. This arrangement not proving to be satisfactory, the agitation went on until at length in 1854 it was voted to secularize the Clergy Reserve after paying definite sums of money in satisfaction of the life interest of claimants.¹ This settlement was greatly deplored by Bishop Strachan, as a serious disaster to the Church of England. But there is reason to believe that he completely misjudged the issue. As is remarked in a recent history of Canada: "Every part of America has demonstrated that the sympathies and energies of a Church are more developed, and its more intelligent and careful management secured, when the people support their own clergy by individual contribu-

¹ Compare Gregg, History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, pp. 406-439.

tions. The Church of England out of the wreck of the Clergy Reserve succeeded in saving a portion which was commuted and consolidated into an endowment fund. It is a question to-day whether even this has not been a 'brake' upon the wheels of progress of that Church."¹

In point of numbers both the Methodist and the Presbyterian communion in British America have outstripped the Church of England. Both were in the field very soon after the beginning of the English rule.

Methodism in the Eastern Provinces may be traced back to the year 1765, when John Coughlan, a Wesleyan preacher commenced his labors in Newfoundland. Some years later there was a group of Methodists in Nova Scotia, which conducted meetings for prayer and exhortation, though without pastoral supervision. In this company, William Black was converted. The evangelistic labors which he began in 1780 were so successful that he soon found it expedient to apply to the Methodist Church in the United States for assistance in caring for the societies which had been organized. In response to this call Freeborn Garrettson came to Halifax in 1785. His preaching and supervision gave a fresh impulse to the work in progress, so that in 1787 he was able to report seven hundred Methodists in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland.

Two local preachers, Tuffey and Neal, connected with the British army, were the first Methodist evangelists in Lower and Upper Canada, or the provinces of Quebec and Ontario as they are now designated. Their labors date from 1780 and 1786 respectively. Prior to

¹ George Bryce, *Short History of the Canadian People*, 1887.

their coming the emigration of Barbara Heck and the family of Philip Embury from New York had provided a nucleus for a Methodist society. In 1788 James M'Carty, a convert of Whitefield, came from the United States and preached with much zeal until he was seized by violent opponents and carried off to an unknown fate.¹ The period of more regular and continuous labor in this region began in 1790, when William Losee, with the consent of his Presiding Elder, Freeborn Garrettson, crossed from the Lake Champlain district. By 1800 nearly a thousand members had been gathered into societies affiliating with the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. In 1824 the Canadian societies were constituted a distinct conference, and in 1828 they were granted an independent status by action of the General Conference. The separation was effected with entire friendliness, the main ground for it being the embarrassment to which political jealousy exposed the Methodists in Canada as being ecclesiastically connected with a country that had recently been at war with Great Britain. Meanwhile the Wesleyan body in England had been contributing to the growth of Canadian Methodism. In 1820 it was arranged that Upper Canada should be left to the Methodist Episcopal Church while the Wesleyans should have the field to themselves in Lower Canada. Five years after the concession of independence by the General Conference to the Methodists of Upper Canada a union was effected with the Wesleyan Church. Some however, were dissatisfied with this action, and reorganized the Methodist Episcopal Church of Canada. It was in this time of

¹ Playter, *History of Methodism in Canada*.

transition that one of the most distinguished representatives of Methodism in the provinces entered upon his influential career. We refer to Egerton Ryerson. The manner in which the young preacher responded to derogatory comments upon the Methodists by Strachan in 1825 was enjoyed by a large proportion of the people, and was taken as a prophecy of future eminence.

In respect of union the Canadian Methodists have recently afforded an excellent example to their brethren this side of the border. An incentive in this direction seems to have been supplied by the political unification of the Dominion. In 1867, in pursuance of the British North American Act, the four Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, were connected as members of a confederation, which subsequently was joined by Manitoba, British Columbia, and Prince Edward Island. The union of the several Methodist bodies was commenced in 1874 and carried to completion in 1884.

An epitome of the educational work of Methodism in the Dominion of Canada was thus given at the Ecumenical Conference of 1891: "In the fourteen higher educational institutions belonging to Canadian Methodism, we have 2,522 students, taught by 157 professors and tutors. The annual income of these institutions is \$190,209, and their endowments and other assets amount to over \$1,300,000. They have in the past fifty years graduated over 3,300 young men and women in the various courses of study, nearly 600 of these receiving the B. A. degree. Of the students, 208 are pursuing the divinity course, affording a full supply of educated men for the ranks of our ministry. Victoria

University has this year entered upon its fifty-first year of university work, and next year Mt. Allison will celebrate the jubilee year of its foundation.”¹

Among the immigrants from continental Europe who were introduced into Nova Scotia in 1751, a number belonged to the Reformed Church, and were essentially Presbyterian in doctrine and discipline. But as they remained for a considerable interval without pastoral supervision, they afforded a less positive beginning for the Presbyterian Church in that province than did settlers from Ireland and New England, who came shortly after the expatriation of the Acadians in 1755. James Lyon from New Jersey (1764) and Samuel Kinlock from Scotland (1766) were the first preachers among the settlers, and James Murdoch (1766) the first Presbyterian minister who was permanently settled in Nova Scotia. In 1817, when the Synod of Nova Scotia was organized, there were twenty-three Presbyterian ministers in the Eastern Provinces, of whom nineteen were connected with the Synod. In the western provinces there was not so early a growth of the Presbyterian interest, but a much greater expansion ultimately. A beginning was made at Quebec shortly after the capture of the city by the English.

Ireland and Scotland being the principal recruiting grounds of Canadian Presbyterianism, there was naturally a reproduction of the ecclesiastical divisions which obtained in those countries. But happily the separating walls have not proved to be insuperable. The year 1876 found the vast majority of Presbyterians in the

¹ William Briggs, *Christian Advocate*, Oct. 29, 1891.

Dominion united in a single body bearing the name of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. This Church, while falling a little behind the Methodist in respect of numbers, is considered second to none of the Protestant communions of the country in point of wealth. The progress which it has made in provision for ministerial education was described in 1885 as follows: "Previous to 1817 there was no educational institution in British North America in which students might be trained for the ministry of the Presbyterian Church, and the Pictou Academy, which was opened for this purpose in that year, remained for a long time the only institution of the kind in the country. But at present there are in the Dominion six Presbyterian colleges in which ministers may be trained,—one in Halifax, one in Quebec, one in Montreal, one in Kingston, one in Toronto, and one in Winnipeg. In these colleges there are fifteen theological professors and one hundred and forty-four theological students, besides about an equal number of students in literary classes in preparation for the ministry."¹

While Congregationalism was represented at an early date by a number of churches in the eastern provinces, it made but little progress for a long interval after the Revolutionary War. Its principal gains in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario have been secured since 1840. The Baptists constitute much the larger body in the Dominion holding the principles of the Congregational polity. Their chief strength is in the maritime provinces. As early as 1817 they numbered here about

¹ Gregg, History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, p. 575.

26,000. Three fourths of their whole membership as reported in 1881 belonged to this part of the Dominion.

The substitution of British for French rule tended in a measure to strengthen the sense of direct connection with Rome on the part of Canadian Roman Catholics, since the French government had assumed no small share in the control of ecclesiastical affairs, and its function in this respect could not willingly be conceded to a Protestant power by those who looked upon Protestantism as deadly heresy. Still, there was no rapid drift toward the high papal theory. "Except in the diocese of Montreal," says a competent observer, "there was no part of Canada in which the Ultramontane contagion had produced much, if any, visible effect before the promulgation of the Vatican decrees. The episcopal assault on the *Institut Canadien* had commenced several years before. Liberal journals had been denounced by the Bishop of Montreal, and he had refused to admit that laymen had any right to liberty of opinion. But at this time Bishop Bourget, the leader of the Ultramontane movement in Lower Canada had neither the sympathy nor the concurrence of his episcopal colleagues. The palace of the Archbishop of Quebec was still the lingering refuge of Gallicanism, and the other bishops were far more in sympathy with the Archbishop than with the Bishop of Montreal."¹

But after the Vatican Council Ultramontanism of a radical type passed rapidly into the ascendant, at least in the Province of Quebec. The Fifth Provincial Coun-

¹ Charles Lindsey, *Rome in Canada, 1877*, pp. 3, 4.

cil (1873), after quoting the language of the Council of Florence, added : "We wish that this solemn decree should be frequently inculcated upon the faithful of this province, in order that they all may know that the Sovereign Pontiff, the legitimate successor of Saint Peter, has the primacy in all the Church, in such a manner that all proceeds from him as from the source of spiritual authority, and that all converges toward him as toward the centre of unity, and that he is able of his own proper right to issue decrees upon faith, morals, and discipline which all the faithful are bound to obey in spirit and in heart."¹ The same council declared the subordination of the civil power to the Church, compared *Catholic Liberalism* to the serpent which crawled into paradise to tempt the human race to its fall, and ordained that absolution should be denied to parents who, when advised to the contrary, should persist in sending their children to Protestant or non-religious schools.

Like sentiments were repeated in the joint pastoral which the bishops of the Province of Quebec issued in 1875, together with very plain hints that polities should be used as an instrument of Ultramontane propaganda. The priests were instructed that cases might arise which would make it incumbent upon them to direct the vote of their parishioners, with the understanding that those discarding their direction would be liable to church censures. In the same connection they were advised of their exemption from the authority of civil tribunals as respects their official conduct. As they might employ the confessional to determine whether

¹ Cited in Mandements, Lettres Pastorales, et Circulaires des Évêques de Québec, Nouvelle Série, ii. 288, 289.

their parishioners had voted according to instructions, they could evidently, under this scheme, defeat the intent of the secret ballot, and use the pulpit as a means of irresponsible and slanderous attack upon any party or person. The clergy in not a few instances took the warrant for political action which was given them by the bishops in its full length and breadth. Indeed, it was soon found expedient to put a check upon them by reason of the odium which their tactics incurred, and in 1877 the priests were counselled to content themselves with declaring principles, leaving their flocks to make the application to persons and parties.¹

The denunciation of *Catholic Liberalism* by the prelates meant a special intolerance toward journals not strictly in line with the hierarchical programme. In a circular to the clergy, issued by the Archbishop of Quebec in 1876, it was characterized as a species of apostasy for a Catholic to profess, as was done by the editor of *Le Réveil*, an intention not to treat of religious matters. This, the Archbishop conceived, made the journal an object of just suspicion from the start; and when he found that it had the audacity to report a speech of the Spanish statesman Castelar in behalf of religious liberty, he concluded that it was time to interdict it to the faithful.² The industry of the priests in suppressing unacceptable periodicals may be judged from the following, written shortly after the proscription of *Le Réveil*: "It has become the habit of the curés, in the country parishes, to denounce in the church every journal which is displeasing to them on political grounds; to proscribe and anathematize it as pernicious;

¹ Mandements, ii. 46.

² Ibid. i. 421.

to threaten to refuse the sacraments to all who still persist in continuing to receive it. The confessional is used as a means of discovering the disobedient; and even the wives of the subscribers to the obnoxious journals are refused absolution if they fail to influence their husbands to obey the priest's command.”¹ Some years later a Canadian Roman Catholic historian, speaking of the reviews which had thus far been founded among his countrymen, said that they were closed against free pens. “Terror and submission,” he added, “are the watchwords everywhere adopted.”² Doubtless facts of this order were prominently in the mind of a Roman Catholic writer on this side of the border when he penned the following: “Canada is nearer the Catholicity of the fifteenth century than the Christianity of the nineteenth century. There is no rule of freedom or intelligence, but a false worship of authority that subjects mind, conscience, and means to its own advancement. ‘Mortal sin’ and the ‘terrors of hell’ preached to the dumb soul are powers of subjection and tyranny as potent to-day as was the torture of the Inquisition,—the prison, the tower, the bastile, the rack, the torch, of the centuries of spiritual darkness and confusion.”³

The declaration of Pius IX. that baptized Protestants are in a manner subjects of Roman Catholic authority has been noticed in another connection. A very distinct echo of this sentiment has been heard in Canada. Vicar-General Truteau, being asked under examination whether the Church of Canada claimed jurisdiction over

¹ Lindsey, *Rome in Canada*, pp. 26, 27.

² Sulte, *Histoire des Canadiens Français*, 1884, viii. 153.

³ J. T. Reily, *Passing Events in the Life of Cardinal Gibbons*, p. 426.

such bodies as the Institut Canadien, in which there were non-Catholics, replied : “ ‘ The jurisdiction which the Church of Canada exercises is a part of the universal jurisdiction of the Church. The Church regards as those over whom she can exercise jurisdiction all persons who have been baptized. There are, therefore, only non-baptized persons belonging to the Institut Canadien who are not subject to the authority of the Church ; all others are subject to that authority whether they be Catholics or Protestants. And on this principle I consider that the entire body of the Institute was bound to conform to the exigencies of the Church.’ To the objection that this doctrine made all Protestants members of the Roman Catholic Church, the Vicar-General replied that the Church had cast them from her bosom, and did not regard them as members, but claimed that in virtue of the baptism they had received, they were subject to her jurisdiction, from which they could not release themselves, though she had the right to deprive them of all advantage of connection with her.”¹ Thus Protestants are placed in the position of subjects without rights. The fact that they are totally destitute of rights has been asserted with great bravery by the Jesuit Braün. In his work on Christian marriage, published with the express approbation of the administrator of the diocese of Quebec, and the Bishops of Quebec and Three Rivers, he says : “ It is customary to regard Protestantism as a religion which has its rights. This is an error. Protestantism is not a religion ; Protestantism has not a single right. It possesses the force of seduction. It is a rebellion in triumph ; it

¹ Lindsey, pp. 332, 333.

is an error which flatters human nature. Error can have no rights ; rebellion can have no rights.”¹ Of course there are many Roman Catholics in Canada who have little appetite for so rank a portion of Ultramontane bigotry as this.

As was intimated above, the prelates of Quebec have pronounced emphatically against undenominational schools. They have also taken pains to encourage Roman Catholics in other provinces to oppose them. Nevertheless, the plan of non-sectarian schools obtains in five provinces, namely : Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, and Manitoba.

According to the census of 1891 the ecclesiastical statistics of Canada stand as follows : Roman Catholics, 1,990,465 ; Methodists, 847,469 ; Presbyterians, 755,199 ; Church of England adherents, 644,106 ; Baptists, 303,749 ; Lutherans, 63,979 ; Congregationalists, 28,155.

IV.—PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENTS IN SPANISH AMERICA AND BRAZIL.

AT the time when Mexico and the other States of Spanish America achieved their independence they were exclusively Roman Catholic, except in quarters where paganism had remained unconquered. In some parts of South America the pagan element was still considerable. It has recently been estimated that Brazil contains a million wild Indians.²

Exclusive possession by the Romish Church, however, was not found to be a safeguard against disputes and

¹ Lindsey, p. 216.

² Brazilian Missions, Monthly Bulletin, Jan. 1888.

antagonisms. In most of the States a progressive party sprang up, which became averse to the dominant influence of the Church, as being in the way at once of proper liberty and of material prosperity. The clergy, to the best of their ability, fought for retaining the old status. But in nearly the whole area under review the victory has been with the liberal or progressive party, and the Church has been obliged to relinquish much of its privilege and authority. A few years since a prominent Roman Catholic writer, contrasting the position of his Church in the United States with that assigned to it south of her borders, drew this sombre picture: "In the Spanish American republics the government has fallen into the hands of infidels, and is controlled by secret societies. There the Catholic religion is oppressed; every form of religion, Christian or heathen, is free and encouraged; but Catholics who are attached to their faith have no rights. . . . The Church has been plundered of its property; bishops are driven out at the whim of any president or dictator; religious orders, with other institutions of education and charity, have been suppressed; the outward manifestation of religion, even the wearing of the cassock, processions and the like, are prohibited."¹ An element of exaggeration may be detected here, as well as a special direction of sympathy; but a general basis of fact underlies the representation, and it may serve to indicate that the attempt of the Romish hierarchy to rule those countries in its own interest has not been eminently successful.

The great era of the struggle and triumph of the liberal party in Mexico includes the fifteen or twenty

¹ J. G. Shea, *Catholic Review*, 1887.

years which followed the promulgation of the Constitution of 1857. The constitutions of the preceding period of unrest, experiment, and turmoil had recognized in general the privileged position of the Roman Catholic Church, and had extended no tolerance to dissent. On the other hand, the Constitution of 1857 ignored the title of the Roman Catholic religion to special guardianship and support by the State, and in the interpretation of both friends and foes was understood to favor freedom of religious profession and worship. It became therefore at once an object of attack from the side of the clergy and the conservatives. The oath of allegiance to such a constitution was denounced as an affront to the Roman Catholic religion. So fierce was the opposition that the liberal president, Comonfort, was constrained to retire in 1858. His party, however, was not left without a competent standard-bearer; for Juarez, who was elected to the presidency, was equal to the crisis, — a man of invincible determination, the greatest representative of the pure Indian stock, if we judge him by his achievements, that this continent has produced. Most of the States of Mexico adhered to Juarez, and after an armed conflict of three years he had practically overthrown the opponents of the Constitution.

But, while defeated at home, the clericals were not at the end of their expedients. Their agents were busy in Europe. The ear of Louis Napoleon was gained. Under cover of securing certain French claims, troops were introduced¹ (1862), and the project of allying

¹ England and Spain joined France in the intervention, but soon withdrew as being unwilling to proceed to so great an aggression as was undertaken by the agents of the French Emperor.

Mexico with the monarchies of Europe, and thus building up an offset to the influence of the great republic of the new world, was pushed forward. In 1864 the Austrian Archduke, Maximilian, arrived to fill the throne which the French intervention had provided for him.

Maximilian came with the formal blessing of Pope Pius IX. In the design of this reactionary Pontiff he was to serve as an instrument for restoring and sustaining the principles of theocratic rule in Mexico. In a letter bearing date of October 18, 1864, the Pope gave this instruction : "Your Majesty is well aware that in order to repair efficaciously the evils occasioned by the revolution and to restore as soon as possible happy days to the Church, it is necessary, above all things, that the Catholic religion, *to the exclusion of every dissenting worship*, should continue to be the glory and the support of the Mexican nation; that the bishops should be entirely free in the exercise of their pastoral ministry; that the religious orders should be re-established and reorganized, in conformity with the instructions and the powers which we have given; that the patrimony of the Church and the rights which pertain thereto should be guarded and protected; that no one should obtain license to teach and to publish false and subversive maxims; that the instruction, as well public as private, should be directed and watched over by the ecclesiastical authority; and that, finally, the chains which, up to the present, have held the Church in dependence upon the arbitrary will of the civil government should be broken."¹

¹ Quoted by E. Lefèvre, *Histoire de l'Intervention Française au Mexique*, ii. 16.

The nuncio who bore the missive of Pius IX. seconded the will of his master by an explicit protest against the scheme of religious tolerance proposed by Maximilian, declaring that this tolerance was contrary to the doctrine of the Church and to the sentiments of the Mexican people.¹ In the latter affirmation he was at least partly right. The leaders of the clerical party sustained the papal programme in preference to that of Maximilian. "With regard to religious tolerance," said the bishops, "we can see nothing that renders it, not to say urgent, but even excusable."

Maximilian soon had abundant reason to wish himself back in Austria. He found himself thrust upon an unwilling people by exterior force; and the tokens became unpleasantly distinct that even this treacherous support must give way when the United States, emerging from the embarrassments of a great civil conflict, had an opportunity to make effective protests against the presence of the French troops in Mexico. Left without adequate financial resources, hampered by connection with a party whose bigotry insisted upon an ecclesiastical policy that was against the current of the age, and counter also to his own feeling and judgment, cooling thus the attachment of his friends while he did not win over his opponents, he advanced rapidly to the final catastrophe in which crown and life were sacrificed. His execution (June 19, 1867) invites to sentiments of pity when it is considered that the persuasions of others, more than his own choice, led him into the disastrous enterprise. Still, the compassion elicited by his fate would be much greater had not the project

¹ E. Lefèvre, *Histoire de l'Intervention Française au Mexique*, ii. 18.

of which he was made the figure-head been an unjustifiable assault upon the liberty of a nation, and had not he invited severity against himself by issuing a cruel decree against his opponents in arms.¹

The reactionary policy of the clergy and their alliance with the agents of a foreign domination naturally have disposed the victorious liberals to fortify the government against ecclesiastical control. Anti-clerical laws of a sweeping character have been placed on the statute-book, such points being included as nationalization of church property, limitation of the right of the Church to acquire real estate, abolition of religious orders, secularization of public education, license and protection for dissenting forms of worship, and the requirement of civil marriage. Most of this reformatory legislation was included in the supplement to the Constitution of 1857 which was prepared in 1873.

The great reverse in their fortunes was in large part earned by the Mexican clergy. Such at least is the verdict of a Roman Catholic writer who had a fair opportunity to acquaint himself with the state of the Church in Mexico. "The Mexican clergy," says the Abbé Domenech, "have been punished with blindness, because they have done despite to the elementary principles of the divine law, by their ignorance, their love of riches, and their scant morality. . . . Since 1846 they have not ceased to complain against the acts more or less arbitrary of which they have been the object; but to these complaints one could reply: 'Stand back! let

¹ The so-called Black Decree of Oct. 3, 1865, condemned to capital punishment, to be executed within twenty-four hours of the sentence, any one found guilty of bearing arms in the republican interest.

pass the justice of God.’’¹ Among the sins against morality which have disgraced the clergy, simony and unchastity are specially noted. ‘‘They make merchandise,’’ he says, ‘‘of the sacraments, and make money by every religious ceremony, without thinking that they are guilty of simony, and expose themselves to the censures of the Church. If Roman justice had its course in Mexico one half of the Mexican clergy would be excommunicated. . . . In my travels in the interior of Mexico many pastors have refused me hospitality in order to prevent my seeing their *nieces* and *cousins* and their *children*. It is difficult to determine the character of these connections. Priests who are recognized as fathers of families are by no mean rare. The people consider it natural enough, and do not rail at the conduct of their pastors, excepting when they are not contented with *one* wife. . . . If the Pope should abolish all simoniacal livings, and excommunicate all the priests having concubines, the Mexican clergy would be reduced to a very small affair. Nevertheless, there are some worthy men among them, whose conduct as priests is irreproachable.’’²

The same author questions whether the religion of Mexico is worthy of being styled *Catholic*. ‘‘The abuse of external ceremonies,’’ he observes, ‘‘the facility of reconciling the devil with God, the absence of internal exercises of piety, have killed the faith in Mexico. It is vain to seek good fruit from the worthless tree which makes Mexican religion a singular assemblage of heart-

¹ Emmanuel Domenech, *Histoire du Mexique*, iii. 447, 448.

² *Le Mexique tel qu'il est*, 1867, quoted by William Butler in his ‘‘Mexico in Transition,’’ pp. 32, 33.

less devotion, shameful ignorance, insane superstition, and hideous vice. . . . It would require volumes to relate the Indian superstitions of an idolatrous character which exist to this day. For want of serious instruction we find in the Catholicism of the Indians numerous remains of the old Aztec paganism."

This may have been written in a somewhat pessimistic mood, and with insufficient allowance for the patronage recently extended to superstitious devotion by the highest authorities of the Roman Catholic Church. But the abbé is not a solitary witness, and there is good reason to think that the facts have come sadly near to his description. From the Conquest to the age of Juarez Mexico had made very little progress in religious intelligence. It is not fair, of course, to use local events as an index of the whole country. Still, there is no injustice in saying that it is not every section of Christendom which could have given occasion, in the last half of the nineteenth century for the following record: "In 1869, in a town of the district of Jonacatepec, State of Mexico, not far from the capital, a woman accused of witchcraft was burnt to death, after suffering much torture, by means of which the acknowledgment was wrung out of her that she was really a witch. On the 7th of April, 1874, two men were burnt at the stake, under a regular sentence of court, in San Juan de Jacobo, district of Concordia, in Sinaloa, for having during the period of six months bewitched another man. The authors of the outrage were arrested and subjected to a trial for murder."¹

Soon after the collapse of the imported government

¹ H. H. Bancroft, *Mexico*, vi. 596.

set up by Napoleon III. Protestant missionaries from the United States began to enter Mexico. A slight preparation for their work had been made in the preceding years by agents of Bible distribution,¹ and the attitude of the government afforded a promising outlook for their enterprise. At the first General Assembly of Evangelical Missions, which met in the City of Mexico in 1888, eleven denominations were represented, namely: the Baptists, North and South; the Friends; the Presbyterians, North and South; the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; the Episcopalian; the Associate Reformed Presbyterians; the Congregationalists; and the Methodist Episcopal Church. At the beginning of 1892 it was estimated that the missions embraced above sixteen thousand communicants, and nearly fifty thousand adherents.²

This progress was not made without some costly sacrifices. Only one missionary, it is true, fell a victim to an intolerant fanaticism;³ but fifty-seven of the native converts atoned for their change of faith with their lives. This shedding of martyr blood was undoubtedly regretted by the less bigoted portion of the people, and took place in direct opposition to the will of the government, which has spared no proper pains to protect the missionaries and their adherents.

¹ For twenty years, reaching back to 1854, Miss Melinda Rankin labored with unwearied zeal to introduce the Scriptures into Mexico. Her agents carried on the perilous work of distribution in the northern portions of the country.

² William Butler, *Mexico in Transition*, chap. x.

³ This was the Congregationalist missionary, J. L. Stephens, who was killed at Ahualulco in 1874.

Central America, after the initiation of independence was united for a short interval with Mexico. When this relation was sundered it was organized into a federal republic. The first constitutional congress of the Estados Federados de Centro America was convened in 1825. The federation, however, seemed to lack the proper cement, and before 1840 Central America had been resolved into five independent States. Subsequent efforts to restore the union have been abortive.

During the period when the federal constitution was in force the tendency was toward the ascendancy of a liberal or anti-clerical policy. In 1826 the congress declared that the nation would no longer receive or recognize within its territory any religious orders. In 1832 freedom of conscience was proclaimed.

The conditions under which the central government was overthrown involved a reaction in favor of the ecclesiastical interest. But this was not of the most pronounced character; and since the middle of the century the several States have resorted more or less to the measures which are commonly regarded in Spanish America as part and parcel of a "liberal" programme. In 1871 the government of Guatemala expelled the Jesuits. The next year it ordered the extinction of religious communities of men, and two years later provision was made for closing the nunneries. At the same time the immunities of the clergy in both civil and criminal causes were cancelled, and freedom of worship was declared. The constitution of Salvador, as adopted near 1880, guaranteed the free exercise of all religions not discordant with morality and public order. Costa Rica dismissed the Jesuits in 1884. In

practice this State has accorded in recent years a full measure of religious liberty. Nicaragua, though placing in general but moderate restraints upon priestly influence, has paid the ordinary compliment to the Jesuits. They were ordered out of the country in consequence of a disturbance which they fomented in 1881.

The Central American States generally have adopted the system of free public schools; but in some of them the system has not been given a creditable efficiency.

Up to the closing decade of the nineteenth century no considerable effort had been made to spread the Protestant faith in Central America. By the cession of the Mosquito coast in 1860, the Moravian mission, which was started among the Indians in that region in 1849, was brought within the limits of the Republic of Nicaragua. President Barrios, in his radical attempt to modernize Guatemala, was disposed to solicit the introduction of Protestantism, and took pains, shortly before his death in 1885, to commend personally a representative of the Presbyterian Board.

In South America the old colonial type, with very little modification, is presented by Ecuador. Conservatism has not indeed so completely possessed the country as to exclude all indications of a liberal party; but it has been dominant, and has left only a very narrow inlet for any new influences. All interests are subordinated to the supposed welfare of the Church, and the Church here is a mediæval institute with some coloring from aboriginal tastes and modes of thought superinduced. As described by a visitor a few years since, Ecuador was blessed with a church for every one

hundred and fifty people, with priests, monks, and nuns amounting together to a tenth part of the population, but throughout its whole extent had not a single railroad or even a stage-coach, printed no newspaper outside of the town of Guayaquil, and could boast of but forty-seven post-offices. Education was under ecclesiastical control, and legislation was shaped by ecclesiastical influence. The majority of parents were living in concubinage rather than in the relations of marriage, since a fee was charged for the marriage ceremony which none of the Indian population could ever think of paying.¹

In Ecuador there has been, of course, no tolerance for a dissenting worship. The other South American republics, on the contrary, while making in general Roman Catholicism the religion of the State, have adopted the principle of tolerance. Peru was recently reported, it is true, as still harboring a law against all dissenting forms of worship, and one finds there something of the conservative aspect which distinguishes Ecuador; but still, this republic allows in practice a measure of tolerance. Under at least one of its presidents (1869–1876) a conspicuous effort was made to limit the power and influence of the Church.

In Chili the liberal party has been so far in the ascendant as to expel the Jesuits, open the cemeteries to the burial of non-Romanists, establish non-sectarian schools, and pass a law requiring civil marriage. Ecclesiastical property has been spared, and the monastic orders, with the exception of the Jesuits, have been allowed to continue in residence; but the spirit of the people will not brook clerical domination. As in others

¹ W. E. Curtis, *The Capitals of Spanish America*.

of the Spanish American countries, a large proportion of the men pay very scant respect to the confessional, and are seldom seen at mass.

The Argentine Republic, as it is one of the most modern of the South American States in all that pertains to the development and use of material resources and appliances, has been distinguished for the most part by a relative independence in its attitude toward the hierarchy. One observer has concluded that independence in too many instances has passed over into religious indifference, and that a hard, materialistic spirit prevails among the people.¹ Education in secular lines is well provided for by universities, by a thorough system of public schools, and by a compulsory education law.

In Uruguay the sceptre passed a few years since from the hands of the priests into those of the liberals. The crisis came under President Santos, and the measures which he dictated ran through the whole scale of the "liberal" scheme. Some of them were sufficiently drastic. "The first step," says Curtis, "was to take the education of the children out of the hands of the Church by establishing free schools and a compulsory education law, under which the parish schools were not recognized in the national system of education. Then the registration of births and deaths was taken from the parish clergy, and placed in the hands of the civil officials. The next thing was the passage of the civil marriage law, similar to that of France, which required every couple to be married by a magistrate, in order that the legitimacy of their offspring might be established. This was a serious blow at the revenues of the Church, as its income

¹ Theodore Child, *The Spanish American Republics*.

from marriage fees was very large. It formerly cost twenty-five dollars to get married, and very few of the peons, or laboring classes, could afford the luxury. Now it costs but one dollar. The Church submitted to all assaults upon it until the marriage law was passed, and then it openly defied the civil authorities, and threatened to excommunicate all members who obeyed the statute.”¹ This challenge was met by Santos in no indecisive fashion. Priests who preached the doctrine of defiance were ordered to be arrested; the protesting nuncio of the Pope was given forty-eight hours to leave the country; and houses of religious seclusion were abolished as being hot-beds of political conspiracy. This last measure was consummated in 1885.

Since the overthrow of the Lopez tyranny, Paraguay has adopted a progressive policy. Free schools are supported as far as the depleted condition of the country will allow. The administration in Colombia and Venezuela in recent years has also been of the progressive type, while a conservative spirit has prevailed in Bolivia. In Venezuela President Guzman Blanco has fulfilled a rôle much like that of Santos in Uruguay.

Brazil under the rule of Dom Pedro II. witnessed not only the abolition of slavery, which was completed in 1888, but also the promotion of public education, and a general abridgment of ecclesiastical influence over the body politic. One reason for the proclamation of a republican form of government at the close of 1889 was the desire to save the country from the reactionary policy which the heir of the Emperor, under the stimulus of the priests, was inclined to inaugurate.

¹ Capitals of Spanish America, pp. 612, 613.

Among those who are nominally Roman Catholics, much of indifference and not a little of ill-disguised hostility is felt toward the Romish Church in Brazil. This may be seen from two important testimonies, which, even if they are not taken in their entire breadth, must be regarded as significant. The first is from the "Rio News," an influential commercial paper published in English. Commenting on the failure of the chamber of deputies to adopt the measure proposed by the senate in behalf of full religious liberty, this journal says: "The actual condition of affairs in Brazil shows that the Catholic Church has no basis whatever for its claim of precedence and official protection beyond the mere circumstance that these privileges have been enjoyed for a certain number of generations. Its authority and precedence, however, is only nominal, for a majority of the men in this country are unquestionably unbelievers in its teachings and influence. Brazil is full of positivists, spiritualists, and free-thinkers, of every kind and description. Among young men of education and social position, scoffing at the Church is a fashionable amusement, and we have seen it carried to the extent of publicly jeering at the priests in public places. Between childhood and old age, periods of unquestioning submission and the fear of death, the male Brazilian is an unbeliever and a free-thinker, and his support of the Church is more a matter of deference to the other sex — who are here the zealous supporters of the Church — and of conservatism before antiquated institutions, than because of any active, reasoning sympathy. He will keep the Church for his wife and daughters, and at the same time be himself an ardent positivist or spiritual-

ist.”¹ The second testimony is taken from the contribution of a priest to a Brazilian clerical paper. “Whoever reads the history of Brazil,” says the writer, “especially in later times, will learn that the government destroyed by an edict the religious orders, prohibiting the receiving of novices; that no country pays such insignificant salaries to its church officials; that two bishops were shamefully imprisoned for observing faithfully the pontifical bull; that the priests are hindered on every hand in the performance of their duties; that any act directed against the Church is applauded; that a bishop, respected even in Protestant countries, here has not the privileges of any humble citizen. As to the churches, some are already falling into ruin, while others are completely stripped of their paraphernalia. The press is more or less the expression of the national mind. If then Brazil is Catholic, the Brazilian press, or at least the greater part of it, should be Catholic; but the reverse is the fact. With the exception of five or six papers published in the empire, the press is either indifferent or hostile to the Apostolic Catholic Church. What then is the religion of Brazil? Is it the Roman Catholic? The facts, the papers, the members of Parliament, the Catholics themselves, all reply—No!”²

The progress of liberal opinions in South America has opened the door in most sections to Protestantism, though undoubtedly the training of the great mass of

¹ Brazilian Missions, Monthly Bulletin, December, 1888. A writer, who may be presumed to be well informed, concludes that among the men of Brazil there is much more of worldly indifference than either of reasoned belief or unbelief. (Encyclopedia of Missions, edited by E. M. Bliss, 1891.)

² Brazilian Missions, August, 1889.

the people must make its message seem strange, and the prejudice zealously fostered by the priesthood is a barrier in many places that cannot easily be broken through. A fair return, however, has recompensed the labor expended. Several thousand communicants have been gathered, and through the establishment of schools and the distribution of Christian literature a basis has been laid for larger results. The Methodist Episcopal Church early directed attention to this field. In 1836 it sent a representative to Buenos Ayres and another to Rio Janeiro. At a more recent date other South American regions have been entered by its agents, both under the auspices of the missionary society and in prosecution of the work started by Bishop Taylor. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, planted a mission in Brazil in 1878. The Presbyterians of the Northern branch have been represented in Brazil since 1859, and of the Southern branch since 1869. At the reunion of the missions of the two bodies in 1889 they numbered three thousand communicants. Besides supporting work among the aborigines at the southern extremity of the continent, the South American Missionary Society, representing the Church of England, has organized services at various points, though chiefly in the interest of English residents and sailors. The Baptists and Episcopalians of the United States have also a few religious workers in South America.

From the facts as briefly presented, it is evident that all these countries beyond the southern borders of the United States have been confronted with very difficult religious problems, and that a satisfactory settlement has rarely been attained, if indeed it has been reached

in any case. Civil leaders have rightly felt that a domineering priesthood, engrossing an altogether disproportionate share of the national riches, is inconsistent with political health and national prosperity. The evidence was before their eyes and was too glaring to be hid from anything less than incorrigible blindness. But in applying remedies they have afforded rather dangerous precedents,—remedies which involve such a stretch of control by the State over religious association and practice that, unless it be conceded that they were veritable demands of the national life, they cannot be justified without at the same time justifying the Erastian theory which brings religious society into a disparaging subordination to secular authority.

It is not surprising, however, that the Spanish American States have been obliged to contend with difficulties of this nature. What Roman Catholic State that has developed any worthy national spirit has escaped occasions of contention with the Romish hierarchy? Theocratic sovereignty, vaunting its own infallibility, will not share authority on equal terms with any outside party, except under constraint. The civil government which may recognize it nominally is compelled at the same time to regard it with jealousy. An assumption of infallible authority, like that upon which the Romish hierarchy builds, is, under all probable conditions, a foundation for strife between Church and State.

CHAPTER V.

THE EASTERN CHURCH.

THE successor of Alexander I. represented in intensified form the reactionary scheme into which the illustrious Czar gravitated in his later years. "Nicholas I. (1825–1855), with his colossal stature, his imposing presence, his mystic pride, his infatuation for the rôle of a pontiff king, his iron will, his power of work, his taste for even the petty details of government, his passion for military minutiae, was a terrible incarnation of autocracy."¹ The rule of Alexander II., though keeping to the principle of absolutism, was less stern than that of Nicholas. In one point it was signalized by a great advance. The abolition of serfdom in 1861, setting free as it did over twenty-two millions of peasants, must be regarded as one of the greatest social revolutions of modern times. The emancipated serfs were given a complete system of local self-government, and were enabled to secure the permanent use of a portion of land by the discharge of certain quit-rents, with the privilege of acquiring absolute ownership on the payment of purchase-money. By the offer of loans the government provided for the immediate release of the peasants from obligations to their former lords.

¹ Rambaud, History of Russia, iii. 21.

It was a magnificent achievement, this striking of shackles from so many millions. But the Czar earned only a mixed gratitude by the act of emancipation. Many of his nobles thought that the loss of their seigniorial rights ought to be recompensed to them by additional political privileges. As these were not granted, a ferment of discontent began to spread. The contrast between Russian autocracy and the constitutional rule which had generally won the ascendant in European States tended to aggravate ill-feeling. The disappointing result of the Turko-Russian War of 1877, coming before the great losses of the Crimean War had been forgotten, was a still further source of disaffection. Consequently, though the vast majority of the Russian people continued to honor the Czar, and even to hold him in religious reverence, a party of revolutionists was developed, which responded to the repressing hand of the government with desperate resistance. The extremists among the agitators, as making destruction a prime article of their creed, have appropriately been called Nihilists. In 1881 Alexander II. fell a victim to their remorseless zeal. But the shedding of his blood gave no immediate advantage to the revolutionists. The reign of Alexander III. began on a thoroughly autocratic basis, and no token of a disposition to depart from that basis has yet been afforded.

In Russia absolutist rigor in the State has generally had its reflex in the management of ecclesiastical affairs. We are not surprised therefore to find Nicholas I. governing the Church with military decision and treating dissenters with great sternness, or to observe

that Alexander III. besides conducting a systematic persecution of the Jews, is ready from time to time to lay a heavy hand upon various Christian sects.

Within the clerical body of the Established Church the element of conservatism is in general most strongly represented by the higher officials. These, as has been noticed, are taken from the ranks of the celibate or monastic clergy, the highest office to which the married clergy can aspire being that of archpriest. As the married clergy, who man the parishes and make up the great mass of the priesthood, besides being excluded from the higher positions, are provided with a very meagre support, they are naturally more tolerant of change than their superiors, since in their view new conditions can hardly be for the worse, and may possibly bring some advantage. A species of antagonism, real if not ostentatious, exists between the two wings of the clerical body.

The Russian priesthood might properly have been described not long since as an hereditary caste. Before the abolition of serfdom vacancies in the parishes were expected to be filled only from the families of the priests. The servile rank of the vast body of serfs was regarded as intrinsically disqualifying them for the priestly office. Shortly after the emancipation of the serfs the priesthood was made in law open to all classes, and the sons of priests eligible to various callings. Still, the liberty thus granted has been sparingly used in practice, and the Russian clergy remains a distinct class in the State.

According to a recent statement the whole domain of the Russian Church includes sixty bishoprics, forty-

eight of which are within European Russia. The white clergy — that is, the married ecclesiastics as distinguished from the black or monastic — number over 1,400 archpriests, nearly 35,000 priests, and a little less than 7,000 deacons.¹

The dissenters, though rated in government reports at a moderate figure, are believed by competent investigators to include from ten to fifteen millions of adherents. In their opinions and tendencies they cover a wide range. Some of the smaller sects run into extravagant vagaries. A few of them might be described, by reason of their pessimism and extreme negations, as the ecclesiastical counterpart of the Nihilists. But taken in the aggregate the sectaries will not compare unfavorably with the adherents of the orthodox Church. The former excel as regards the general diffusion of elementary education in their ranks. They afford a superior example of industry and sobriety, and to a noticeable extent are disposed to claim a high scale of privilege for women. With a considerable fraction of them the idea of social amelioration, by means of simplicity of living and a benevolent sharing of goods with the needy, is prominent. Count Tolstoi in taking up this plan was distinctly influenced by its representatives among the sectaries.²

The older body of schismatics, or its most important section, the Raskolniki of the priestly branch,³ succeeded near the middle of the nineteenth century in

¹ Dalton, *Die russische Kirche, eine Studie*, 1892.

² N. Tsakni, *La Russie Sectaire*.

³ Called Popovtsi, or priest-possessing, in contrast with the Bezpopovtsi, or priest-rejecting class.

organizing a hierarchy of their own. They have now no less than fifteen bishops. Though their original platform was absurdly narrow, they have come to represent such ideas as must command for them not a little respect. "While they demand the ancient rites and former ecclesiastical constitution, with a national patriarch as supreme head of the Church, they do so with a keen sense of the importance of restricting clerical power within due bounds, and of giving the lay portion of the community its just and proportionate share in the administration of the Church. Their ideal would seem to be a national, popular, and democratic establishment, united and strong, but independent and free from government interference; its affairs under the charge of, and its clergy chosen by, all its members acting in concert."¹ Acts of the government since the middle of the century have acknowledged the title of this branch of the Raskolniki to tolerance.

Among the sects which have recently appeared the Stundists hold an important place. In their advocacy of adult baptism they agree with the Mennonites and Baptists. Their views of priesthood and ceremonial are much like those of the Molokani.² In their notions of property they affiliate in a measure with socialism; but in temper and conduct they are peaceable and law-abiding. The government has attempted with very indifferent success to impede their growth by breaking up and transplanting their communities.

By the partition of Poland Russia acquired jurisdiction over a considerable body of Roman Catholic sub-

¹ A. F. Heard, *The Russian Church and Russian Dissent*, p. 233.

² See the preceding volume, pp. 448, 449.

jects. A great part of these had a bond of connection with the Russian establishment, as being embraced in the Uniate Church, which confessed indeed the supremacy of the Pope, but was allowed to retain Greek usages. A majority of these united with the orthodox Greek Church of Russia in 1839, and many of the remainder in 1875. Among the grounds alleged at the latter date for rejecting connection with Rome were attempts of her agents to intrude Latin rites in place of Greek, and the doctrinal innovations which she had introduced by proclaiming the immaculate conception of the Virgin and the infallibility of the Pope.

Lutheranism is also represented in Russia. Its adherents are located mainly in the northwestern provinces, but are found besides in the Polish region and in parts of Southern Russia. They are said to aggregate two and a half millions.¹ That they should be subjected to more or less pressure to incline them to enter the Established Church, follows as a matter of course from Russian policy.

The revolution (1821–1828) which gave political independence to Greece also brought ecclesiastical autonomy. Since the Patriarch of Constantinople was regarded as in large part an agent of the Sultan for managing the affairs of his Christian subjects, release from the authority of the former was considered to be logically involved in the rejection of the yoke of the latter. A few years after the revolution the status which had been assumed was definitely provided for in the legislation of the nation. “On the 4th of August, 1833, a

¹ Kurtz, Kirchengeschichte, § 209.

decree proclaimed the National Church of Greece independent of the Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople, and established an ecclesiastical synod for the kingdom. In doctrine the Church of liberated Greece remained as closely united to the Church at Constantinople as the Patriarchates of Jerusalem or Alexandria; but in temporal affairs it was subject to a Catholic king instead of a Mohammedan sultan. King Otho was invested with the power of appointing annually the members of the Synod. This Synod was formed on the model of that of Russia; but, in accordance with the free institutions of the Greeks, it received more freedom of action.”¹ In conjunction with this legislation the government undertook reforms which were made necessary by abuses among the clergy and by the demoralized condition of the monastic order. Many of the monasteries, as having very few inmates or being in ruins, were suppressed.

Bulgaria, whether influenced or not by the example of Greece, has made a move toward an independent church establishment. This was seconded by the Sultan (1870–1872), who ordained the founding of an independent ecclesiastical province under the name of the Bulgarian exarchate, to which the neighboring Slavonic provinces could unite themselves by a vote of two thirds of the people. A valid ground of dissatisfaction with the old system had been furnished by the wretched way in which religious matters for Bulgaria had been managed. The higher positions had customarily been given to Greeks who were unacquainted with the lan-

¹ George Finlay, *History of Greece from B. C. 146 to A. D. 1864*, vii. 128, 129.

guage of the country. The liturgy was in a foreign tongue, and in the absence of preaching the people had very scant means of religious edification. The political independence of Bulgaria, as also of Rumania, Servia, and Montenegro, was acknowledged by the Congress of Berlin in 1878.

In the United Armenian Church, or the branch of the Armenians connected with Rome, a disturbance of some note began in 1866. Hitherto this Church had enjoyed the full right of electing its own bishops and patriarchs, as also the privilege of using its ancient liturgy. But now, with the connivance of the newly elected Patriarch Hassun, the Pope arrogated the right to nominate the patriarch, to confirm the bishops, or even to appoint them, and to make the final disposition of ecclesiastical revenues. Much resentment was provoked by this abridgment of long-standing prerogatives. In the absence of Hassun at the Vatican Council a rival patriarch was elected. For a number of years he had a considerable following, but in 1879 was persuaded to make his submission. Near this time the Roman Catholic Armenians were estimated at about three hundred thousand in a population of three millions.¹ Several scores of evangelical churches had at the same time been established among the Armenians.

A branch of the Nestorians is also in connection with Rome. They represent very largely the labors of Jesuit missionaries during the eighteenth century, are distinguished by the name of Chaldaeans, and live in or near the valley of Mesopotamia. The Nestorians of the old type dwell principally in the mountains of Koordistan.

¹ T. C. Trowbridge, *New Englander*, January, 1874.

A mission among them was projected by the American Board in 1833. As described by the first American missionary among them, they repudiate image worship, auricular confession, and the doctrine of purgatory.¹

¹ Justin Perkins, *Residence of Eight Years in Persia among the Nestorian Christians*, 1843.

CHAPTER VI.

A GLANCE AT PROTESTANT MISSIONS.

THE great era of Protestant missions began in the last decade of the eighteenth century. Only three societies had been in operation through any considerable portion of that century, namely, the Propagation Society, the Halle-Danish, and the Moravian; and the first of these worked mainly among English colonists. Before the end of the year 1800 four new societies — the Baptist, the London, and the Church Societies, and the Dutch Society of Rotterdam — had been added to the list. Within the next century this list was multiplied more than tenfold. Taking a deep incentive from the evangelical zeal which sprang out of the Moravian and Methodist movements, Protestant missionary work has gone forward on an ever enlarging scale, until in the last decade of the nineteenth century it appears undoubtedly among the greatest enterprises of the age. The sweeping disparagement which is still occasionally offered to the public by some superficial observer of this or that local field cannot be characterized as anything better than a piece of short-sighted pessimism.

Before the special era of missionary undertakings the most notable efforts were those of the Moravians

and of the laborers who went to India under the auspices of the Danish government. Mention might also be made of the work which accompanied the progress of the Dutch supremacy in the East India Islands, after the early years of the seventeenth century. Reckoned by the standard of numbers this was very successful, the converts being estimated at several hundred thousand before the end of the eighteenth century. But the conversion of the vast majority was rather nominal than real, and it needed only the removal of political influence to show how little had been accomplished by a superficial method of evangelization.

The words of Count Zinzendorf: "The whole earth is the Lord's; men's souls are all His; I am debtor to all," express a sentiment which was warmly cherished by the Moravians. The feeling of Saint Francis, that the lowest and most wretched had the most urgent claims for sympathy and help, became characteristic of the brotherhood and shaped their efforts. They exhibited a predilection for hard fields, and sent into them men who may claim admiration, if not for genius or scholarship, at least for sturdy industry and inexhaustible patience. In 1832, when their whole body, young and old together, amounted to only six hundred, a mission was started for the benefit of the slave population of the West India Islands. The foundation of the undertaking was laid by Leonhard Dober and David Nitschmann on the island of St. Thomas, and was extended thence to other islands. It was a costly service; in the course of fifteen years fifty Moravians found graves in St. Thomas and St. Croix islands. But there was the recompense of a spiritual harvest. By the end of the

eighteenth century 13,300 had been admitted to communion, and in 1881 the number of Moravian members in the West India mission was reported at 36,698. A kindred field, presenting perhaps even greater difficulties, was entered in Guiana. Work was begun here in 1735. Up to the beginning of the present century the result was the baptism of eight hundred and forty-five Indians, fifty-nine Bush Negroes, and seven hundred and thirty-one slaves. A mission among the natives of Greenland was planted in 1733. Hans Egede, a Norwegian, had preceded the Moravians in this field by the space of twelve years. Still, the hearts of the stolid people seemed to be unprepared for the gospel message. First in 1738 the experience of Kaiarnak demonstrated that an Eskimo soul could be melted to penitence and spiritual longing by the story of the cross. From this time a genuine, if slow, progress was enjoyed. By 1801 paganism had disappeared from that part of Greenland belonging to the mission. Some heathen Eskimos, however, came at a later date (1829-30) from the southeastern coast into the neighborhood of the missionaries. Among the natives of Labrador the first convert was won in 1776, about a half-dozen years after the permanent founding of the mission, which had been unsuccessfully attempted in 1752. At a recent date the missionaries in this region had some fifteen hundred Eskimos under their charge. The work of the Moravians among the Indians in the territory of the United States has been referred to in the preceding volume. The mission which they began among the Hottentots in South Africa in 1737 was broken up by the un-Christian opposition of the Dutch settlers.

When resumed in 1792 it experienced some tokens of fierce hostility from the same source. After the final cession of the Cape of Good Hope to Great Britain (1815) better assurance of protection was afforded. Some converts have been won among the Kafirs, though the principal success has been among the Hottentots. The mission in behalf of the natives of Australia was begun in 1850; that in the lofty Himalayan region in 1854. On the whole, the encomium which Bishop Porteus uttered in 1808 has been earned in no small measure by the Moravian missionaries. "These have shown," he said, "a degree of zeal, of vigor, of perseverance, of unconquerable spirit, and firmness of mind, which no danger, no difficulties, could subdue (combined at the same time with the greatest gentleness, prudence, and moderation), of which no example can be found since the first primitive age of Christianity."¹

The first Protestant mission in India was planted under Danish auspices by two young Germans, Bartholomew Ziegenbalg and Henry Plutschau, who had been students at the University of Halle. They were sent out in 1705 and began work at Tranquebar in the following year. The record indicates that they were worthy pioneers in that great field. The labors of Ziegenbalg in particular were noteworthy. Before his death in 1719 he had translated the entire New Testament and a part of the Old into the Tamil language, and had gathered several hundred converts. Among his successors Schultze showed much activity in the work of translating; but in general missionary enterprise the highest distinction was won by Christian

¹ Quoted by A. C. Thompson, *Moravian Missions*, p. 486.

Frederic Schwartz, who came to India in 1750. Joining a sterling character with a winning address, he secured to an extraordinary degree the confidence of all parties, and, without any effort to thrust himself forward, became an important factor in the public affairs of the country. Schwartz ended his career in 1798. The result of missionary labor up to this point has been thus summarized: "Altogether not less than fifty thousand natives of India had abandoned heathenism and embraced Christianity within this period. Most of them had died; and what proportion were still living at the end of the century is difficult to ascertain. That many of the converts were sincere and genuine cannot be doubted. Yet it is certain that the permission to retain their caste customs and prejudices throws considerable suspicion on the spiritual work accomplished among them."¹ As appears from this statement, the first Protestant evangelists in India were more tolerant toward caste than later missionaries have thought to be consistent with gospel principles.

That much of the new zeal for missions which began at the end of the eighteenth century should have expended itself upon India was only natural. A more interesting field for Christian conquest could not well be imagined. Containing about one sixth of the population of the globe, the theatre of a vast historic evolution and struggle of different races, the birthplace of such great religious systems as Brahmanism, Buddhism, and Hinduism, or the modified Brahmanism of later

¹ Sherring, *History of Protestant Missions in India*, 1884.

times,¹ having also its representatives of Zoroastrianism in its Parsi community, and containing its many millions of Mohammedans, possessing a large store of ancient books revered as sacred, relatively rich in philological treasures, and in religious architecture, eminent among the heathen nations as respects the fruits of subtle speculation, and exhibiting one of the most peculiar and complex social structures which the world has ever seen,—India was fitted a century ago, as it is to-day, to attract a special measure of intellectual and religious interest.

The awakened interest, however, was confronted by formidable bars and bolts. Not only did it have to meet

¹ The system embodied in the early Vedic literature is a deification of the powers of nature, with some dim approaches to the theistic point of view, but with greater leanings to pantheism. Out of this system Brahmanism was evolved, distinguished by its pantheistic basis, its elaborate ritual, its emphasis upon caste, and, in the early period of its history, by its prodigality in sacrificial offerings. Buddhism, which arose about five centuries before Christ, was in part a reaction against Brahmanism. Its distinguishing features may be summarized as follows: (1) Disregard of caste distinctions; (2) repudiation of animal sacrifices and of vicarious suffering; (3) great stress upon the doctrine of transmigration; (4) great importance assigned to self-mortification, austerity, and abstract meditation, as aids to the suppression of all action; (5) concentration of all human desires on the cessation of transmigration, or the attainment of a state of complete quiescence; (6) the lack of any recognition of a Supreme Spirit, or of any spirit or soul apart from material organisms. (Compare Monier Williams, Hinduism.) Brahmanism was influenced by its rival, and prepared for a victory over it in India by borrowing some of its peculiarities,—such as a relative tenderness toward animal life, intense stress upon transmigration, and a high valuation of self-mortifications as means of hastening emancipation from the painful bonds of embodied individual existence. On the other hand, it granted a very large indulgence to polytheistic tendencies and idolatrous practices. It became thus the comprehensive and heterogeneous system which is embraced by the great body of the inhabitants of India, and is not inaptly described by the term Hinduism.

the strong resistance of native opinion and prejudice, but the hostility of the East India Company as well. This company, chartered December 31, 1600, by Queen Elizabeth, passed far ahead of all rivals in the middle years of the eighteenth century, until at length at the battle of Plassey in 1757 it gained a foundation for British supremacy over the greater part of the country. For an interval after this date no determination to exclude missionaries was manifested. But by the last decade of the century the managers of the company had come apparently to regard Christianity as contraband in India. They were apprehensive that the natives would be so offended by any form of attack upon their religion, that a violent explosion, destructive of English rule in the country, would result if the claims of the Christian religion should be urged. One of the directors of the company is credited with saying, "I would rather see a band of devils in India than a band of missionaries." Sidney Smith, in a contribution to the "Edinburgh Review" in 1808, was not much more friendly toward those who were attempting to carry the gospel to India. "They would," he said, "deliberately, piously, and conscientiously expose our whole Eastern empire to destruction for the sake of converting half a dozen Brahmans; who, after stuffing themselves with rum and rice, and borrowing money from the missionaries, would run away, and cover the gospel and its professors with every species of impious ridicule and abuse." So largely did this jealous temper govern the administration that Carey, who arrived in India in 1793, and Marshman and Ward, who became his co-laborers a few years later, took refuge in territory

under Danish rule, and made Serampore the seat of their mission. The first missionaries of the American Board, Judson, Newell, Hall, and Nott, received an equally cold welcome. On their arrival in Calcutta, in 1812,—two years after the organization of the Board,—they found the English officials resolved to send them out of the country. That they were not actually sent back to Europe was due to their hasty departure from Calcutta,—Judson and Newell taking ship to Mauritius, and Hall and Nott escaping to Bombay. Judson soon began his great work in Burma, and Newell, after stopping a short time in Ceylon, joined Hall and Nott in Bombay. This abortive persecution, if it did not end the hostility of the East India Company toward missionaries, was the last attempt at formal proscription.

In the new charter which was issued to the Company in 1813 all restrictions upon the entrance of missionaries into India were removed. Nor was this change found at all contrary to the dictates of worldly wisdom. The gospel message proved to be no violent explosive, but rather an ally of peaceful advance. Later officials have seen this, and acknowledged it in emphatic terms. The words of Charles U. Aitchinson, lieutenant-governor of the Punjab, may be taken as an example. "The changes," he wrote in 1886, "that are to-day being wrought out by Christian missionaries in India are simply marvellous. Teaching, wherever they go, the universal brotherhood of man, and animated by a faith that goes beyond the ties of family, caste, or relationship, Christian missionaries are slowly, but none the less surely, undermining the foundations of

Hindu superstition, and bringing about a peaceful, religious, moral, and social revolution.”¹

Before the death of Carey in 1833 the gospel was being preached in forty of the different languages and dialects of India. No inferior part of this advance was contributed by Carey and his collaborators at Serampore. Aside from evangelistic and school work they undertook and accomplished a vast task in the translation of the Scriptures into Bengali, Sanskrit, Persian, Chinese, and other tongues. Through their industry and that of a few others, portions of the Bible, chiefly of the New Testament, had been printed in thirty-one Indian languages and dialects by the close of the first decade of the nineteenth century.

After an experience of great hardships Judson was able to lay a good foundation in Burma. The Karens, or hill people, who form a large element in that province, were discovered to be especially receptive of the gospel message. Judson and his associates labored under the auspices of the American Baptist Missionary Society which was founded in 1814. In 1890 it was able to number in Burma about thirty thousand converts. Another mission of the Baptists in India, which has been distinguished for its remarkable ingathering is that among the Telugus in the Madras Presidency. After a long period of barrenness a great harvest was suddenly provided. In 1879 and the years following the people sought baptism in crowds, the number of communicants reaching beyond thirty thousand in the course of a decade.

The arrival of Alexander Duff in 1830, as a represen-

¹ Quoted by Young, *The Success of Christian Missions*, p. 117.

tative of the Church of Scotland, marked somewhat of an era in missionary and educational methods. Believing that it was true economy to use the English language in teaching the sciences and the higher branches of learning generally, since the requisite text-books were not to be found in the native languages, he boldly faced opposing opinions, and opened a school on that principle in Calcutta. With the employment of the English tongue he joined also a free use of the Bible. His experiment was a magnificent success. It was thus of far-reaching consequence, as it encouraged both the government and missionary societies to make a large use of the English language in colleges and high-grade schools. This policy has naturally stimulated the ambition of the middle and upper classes to acquaint themselves with the English speech. The spread of a European language means unquestionably widened and extended channels for the introduction of European ideas and sentiments. Thus, in its ultimate result, the educational method of Duff is found not to be indifferent to missionary aims.

In Western India the scholarship and practical efficiency of Robert Nesbit and John Wilson acquired for them an eminent place in missionary annals. The work of the former dates from 1827, that of the latter from 1829. Bombay was the principal sphere of their labors.

In the northwestern provinces, where Hinduism has located some of its strongest fortifications, the message of the gospel began to be heard at a few points in the second decade of the nineteenth century. Since the time of the great mutiny (1857) the work in this region

has advanced to large proportions. The Methodist Episcopal mission was started here in the preceding year under the leadership of William Butler. By 1864 results had been achieved which warranted the organization of a Conference. From that time there has been continuous progress, and many new fields have been entered. At the General Conference of 1892, J. M. Thoburn, missionary bishop for India, in making his quadrennial report, declared that there was already need of five Annual Conferences with provision for a sixth in Malaisia at no distant day. "We have now," he said, "a Christian community in India of not less than fifty thousand souls, and a membership, including full members and probationers, of over thirty thousand. All through these past four years we have had inquirers coming to us in steadily increasing numbers, and the latest advices indicate no signs of waning interest. We now receive more converts in a month than we used to receive in a decade."

This report, though it may be exceptionally cheering, is not a little indicative of the advance of missionary achievement in India as a whole. Each decade since the middle of the nineteenth century has witnessed a considerable accession to Protestant Christianity. "The 91,000 native Christians of India proper, in 1851—exclusive of about 54,000 in Burma and 12,000 in Ceylon—rose to 138,000 in 1861, to 224,000 in 1871, and to 417,000 in 1881. Thus in the first decade the increase was 53 per cent, in the second 61, and in the third 86."¹ An estimate of native Protestant Christians which has been given for 1891, or the closing part

¹ Sherring, *History of Protestant Missions in India*, pp. 431, 432.

of 1890, places them at 559,661, besides 89,182 in Burma.

In such a field the number of converts is obviously but an imperfect measure of progress. The undermining of intellectual confidence in their old faith on the part of the educated classes, and the awakening of a spirit of inquiry in other ranks, are results of profound moment, and prophetic of great changes before the lapse of many decades. A ferment is evidently going on which may not tell altogether in favor of Christianity in the first instance, since it may incline many to scepticism, but must at all events tell against paganism. One manifestation of the intellectual disturbance which is in progress is seen in the rise of theistic societies designed to offer a substitute at once for Christianity and Hinduism. Here belong the Adi Brahmo Somaj, founded by Rajah Rammohun Roy, the Brahmo Somaj of India which separated from the former under the leadership of Keshub Chunder Sen, the Sadharan Brahmo Somaj, and the Arya Somaj. While the first of these gave some indulgence to the social system of Hinduism, the second swung clear, in its maxims, of the trammels of that system as well as of polytheism. In the person of its leader it adopted a reverent attitude toward Christ, though not attributing to Him proper divinity. The third Somaj, which arose by a secession from the second, caused in large part by the unfaithfulness of Keshub Chunder Sen to his own prohibition of child marriage, cherishes nearly the same list of precepts as its predecessor. One article of its creed reads as follows: "No created object is to be worshipped as God, nor any person or book to be considered as infalli-

ble and the sole means of salvation ; but truth is to be reverently accepted from all scriptures and the teachings of all persons, without distinction of creed or country." The Arya Somaj, though antagonistic to idolatry and caste, exalts the native oracles far above all others, assuming to build on the Vedas as the truly authoritative books. It appears thus as the most conservative of the native theistic societies.¹

While the Mohammedans of India have not furnished a large number of converts to Christianity, they have been found somewhat more accessible to the gospel message than their co-religionists in Turkey. In Dutch India within a recent period a considerable body of Mohammedans have made profession of Christianity. At the Centenary Missionary Conference in 1888 it was said that nearly all of the eleven thousand converts who had been won in Java were from amongst the Mohammedans. In Sumatra also, as was reported on the same occasion, hundreds had turned from the Koran to the Gospel. This is quite in contrast with the unyielding front presented to the missionaries in Turkey. A part of the difference may be due to different degrees of liberty granted under Mohammedan and Christian rule respectively. As late as 1843, or twenty years after the American Board had planted a mission in Syria, a young man was decapitated for renouncing Mohammedanism in favor of Christianity. Such an excess of rigor may not often have been practised ; but before Turkish law apostasy is undoubtedly reckoned as a serious crime, and it needs the impulsion of high

¹ For an interesting sketch of the topic see Bishop Hurst's "Indika."

religious enthusiasm to enable Mohammedans in Turkey to face the consequences of breaking away from their old faith. Protestantism in this field, therefore, has acted mainly upon various branches of the Eastern Church, so far as manifest fruits are concerned. As a modifying factor in the intellectual and moral atmosphere, it may have accomplished results which cannot yet be properly estimated. Within the Turkish empire, including Egypt, about one hundred and fifty Protestant congregations have been established (1894). An interesting auxiliary to Western culture and Christian influence was provided in the founding of Robert College at Constantinople. The corner-stone of the building was laid in 1869; but collegiate education began six years earlier. The consummation of the enterprise was largely due to Cyrus Hamlin.

China with its unequalled mass of human beings is a field which invites missionary enterprise no less than any other in the world. It may be allowed, however, that, as respects the historic evolution of religions, it is secondary to India. At the base of its existing system lies Confucianism. Conjoined with this are Buddhism and Taouism. The lines between the three are not very distinctly drawn. One may belong to the first without any positive connection with the second or third; but rarely is one a Buddhist or Taouist who may not at the same time be styled a follower of Confucius. In essence Confucianism is rather a system of ethics than a religion proper. Its founder was much of a positivist in his mental tendency. While not denying a transcendental sphere Confucius said next

to nothing respecting the existence and attributes of Deity. His system, with its strong emphasis upon filial duties, supplied more of a basis for ancestor worship than for devotion to any species of superhuman beings. Buddhism in its original character was also decidedly negative in its attitude toward theological doctrine; but as it exists in China, whither it was brought in the first century, it gives so large a place to the worship of various divinities that it serves practically as a religious supplement to the ethics of Confucianism. Taouism, though boastful at the first of philosophical depth and rationalizing in spirit, is now but an inconsequent scheme of polytheism, a mixture of Buddhism with the old nature worship and with hero worship. It holds the preferred place in the religious ceremonial of the State.

Before the opening of Christian ports in 1842 the opportunities for missionary labor were much restricted. A beginning, however, was made before that date. Robert Morrison, the patriarch of the mission in China entered the country in 1807. In 1814 he baptized his first convert. In 1821 the entire Bible, which he had translated with the assistance of William Milne, was published in the Chinese language. Morrison was sent forth under the auspices of the London Missionary Society. The American Board despatched its first representatives in 1829; the American Baptist Union, in 1833; the Methodist Episcopal Church, in 1847. A large number of other societies have also entered the field. In 1890 the number of Protestant communicants stood at 37,287. Viewed absolutely this number does not seem large. But when it is remembered that a thick

wall of prejudice against everything foreign had to be penetrated in China, that the work is still in its pioneer stage, and that each new decade reveals a great advance over the preceding in the rate of increase of converts, the outlook is by no means discouraging.

Before the treaties of 1858, Japan for more than two centuries had been hermetically sealed against Christianity and Western civilization. From that point, as if aroused from a dreamy slumber, she has bestirred herself to grasp as much benefit as possible from Western arts, sciences, political models, and educational methods, and has also offered a free field to the Christian religion. There was indeed a manifestation of jealousy toward Christianity while the preparation was going on for the political revolution of 1868, which overthrew the Tycoon, or military magnate, and restored to the Mikado his ancient supremacy. But this manifestation was only temporary, and remarkably favorable conditions have continued to be presented for the dissemination of Christian teachings.

In Japan Christianity comes into competition with Shintoism and Buddhism, not to mention the agnosticism and scepticism which are imported or encouraged by agents from the Western countries. The former system compares with Taoism in China, not only in the matter of State recognition, but also as respects its leading characteristics, combining as it does nature worship with hero worship and spirit worship. Buddhism, which was introduced in the sixth century of the Christian era, proved to be a successful rival of the native system. Its greater literary wealth and more

serious view of conduct as related to future destiny gave it conspicuous advantages over the Shinto faith.

As soon as the open door was presented, Protestant missionaries began to direct their steps to Japan. The first representatives to appear upon the new field came from the Episcopal Church of the United States, in 1859. Before the close of the same year missionaries from the Presbyterian Church and the Reformed Church in America had arrived. A representative of the Baptists was on hand in 1860. The American Board commenced work in Japan in 1869. The Methodist Episcopal Church followed in 1872, R. S. Maclay from the China mission being the leader of the missionary band. By the labors of these and many others the intellectual and religious life of the Japanese has been touched to a gratifying degree. Among the converts, numbering in 1890 about 25,000, a large proportion are young men, and many of these by their talents and acquirements promise to be widely influential.¹

Africa, with an estimated population of two hundred millions, was largely an unknown land till the middle of the nineteenth century. The labors of Krapf and Rebmann, agents of the Church Missionary Society, who explored from the eastern side of the continent, cast some rays of light upon the interior. Rebmann's discovery in 1848 of Mount Kilima-Njaro has been called the first great step forward in the recovery of Central Africa. The next year David Livingstone, who

¹ For a valuable article on Japan, and a vast storehouse of information on missionary topics generally, see *Encyclopedia of Missions*, edited by E. M. Bliss.

was sent to South Africa in 1840 by the London Missionary Society, made a tour northward for the discovery of Lake Ngami. In 1852-56 he accomplished his remarkable journey across the continent, directing his course to St. Paul de Loanda on the west coast and proceeding thence to Quillimane on the east coast. His subsequent explorations reached northward. In 1859 he discovered Lake Nyassa. During his great final journey he traversed a considerable portion of the most central part of Africa, the region of Lakes Tanganyika and Bangweolo. It was on the southern shore of the latter lake that he died May 1, 1873. In 1858 Burton and Speke, following up the indications which had been given by Krapf and Rebmann, proceeded from the east coast and discovered Lake Tanganyika and the Victoria Nyanza. Stanley, who succeeded in finding Livingstone in 1871, traced the course of the Congo in his second journey (1876, 1877). Near the time of these achievements by Stanley, Sweinfurth and Nachtigal made valuable explorations in the Soudan. More recent adventurers, imitating the example of these hardy pioneers, have added still farther to our knowledge of Africa.

Livingstone regarded "the end of the geographical feat as the beginning of the missionary enterprise." Herein he represented very largely the standpoint of the Christian world. The alacrity with which the churches have sent forth their evangelists into the vast area disclosed by the explorer is no mean token of vitality in nineteenth-century Christianity.

It has been noticed that the Moravians early directed their attention to South Africa. The London Mission-

ary Society has had laborers in that field from 1798, though not continuously in the first two decades of the mission. Its most distinguished representative was Robert Moffat, who began work among the Hottentots in 1816, and in 1821 took up his quarters among the Bechuanas. The Evangelical Missionary Society of Paris planted a mission in Basutoland in 1833, the American Board in Zululand in 1835. The Wesleyans and various other communions are also represented in South Africa. By their combined instrumentality as many as two hundred thousand of the natives in that region have been brought more or less directly under Christian influences.

Western Africa has been a theatre of costly sacrifice. Of the Moravian missionaries who came to the coast of Guinea in 1768 all were soon in their graves. The mission established in the neighborhood of Sierra Leone in 1798 by the united action of two Scotch societies and the London Society did not endure beyond two years. Out of six laborers three succumbed to the climate and one was murdered. The work of the Church Missionary Society, begun in 1804 among the Susu tribes one hundred miles to the north of Sierra Leone, gained a measure of success; but after eleven years, when seven out of fifteen missionaries had died, it was cut short by the machinations of slave-dealers. The Society, however, did not lose heart, and still continued its efforts in behalf of the natives in the neighborhood of Sierra Leone. One of these natives, Samuel Crowther, who as a boy had been carried away into slavery from his home in the Yoruba country, was consecrated Bishop of the Niger in 1864. The Wes-

leyans have also wrought successfully in the same region. Stations have been planted by them along the Gold Coast, in Ashantee, and other parts of Guinea, in Yoruba, Sierra Leone, and on the Gambia. In Liberia the Baptists were represented shortly after the founding of the colony in 1821. The Methodist Episcopal mission here dates from 1833. The heroic founder, Melville B. Cox, died the same year. After 1857 it was not thought best to send white laborers to face the deadly climate, and in the following year Francis Burns, a preacher of African descent, was ordained missionary bishop for Liberia. Among the various foundations in Western Africa we may mention also the Old Calabar mission started by Scotch missionaries in 1846, the Gaboon mission begun by the American Board in 1842, and the mission to the Cameroons instituted by the Baptists in 1845. Several years ago the following summary was given for this section of Africa: "No missions have been marked by more terrible loss of life; the coast is called the White Man's Grave. But fast as laborers have fallen, others have stepped into their place. The standard of the cross has been raised in two hundred central stations. Twenty dialects have been reduced to writing, and the Bible, in whole or in part, has been translated into them; and though only a fringe of the great population has been touched, thirty thousand negroes have been gathered into full communion with the Church."¹

Though so recently unveiled to civilized men, Central Africa has its circle of missionary stations. As the first fruits of Livingstone's explorations, a mission

¹ Robson, *Outlines of Protestant Missions.*

fostered by the Universities of Oxford, Durham, and Dublin, and hence called the "Universities' Mission" was projected. The band of laborers set sail in 1860 under the leadership of Edward Mackenzie, who was made bishop. The site chosen was in the eastern part of Central Africa near the river Shire. Disturbances and misfortunes, including the death of the bishop, caused this locality to be abandoned. Bishop Tozer, Mackenzie's successor, fixed upon Zanzibar, with the design of educating native evangelists for work in the interior. The Free Church of Scotland planted a mission on the shore of Lake Nyassa in 1875. Near the same time the Established Church of Scotland sent a missionary band to the highlands above the Shire. The Church Missionary Society projected a mission on the shores of Lake Victoria Nyanza in 1876, and succeeded in establishing several stations there. In 1877 and 1878 the London Society began work on the borders of Lake Ngami and Lake Tanganyika respectively. Missionaries sent out by the East London Institute entered the Congo valley in 1878. Later their enterprise was handed over to the American Baptist Union. The American Board made choice of the country of Bihe, two hundred and fifty miles from the coast, on the Coanza river. William Taylor, representing the Methodist Episcopal Church after his appointment as missionary bishop of Africa, in 1884, has supervised missions in the Congo region, as well as in Angola and other districts. As appears from his address to the General Conference in 1892, he was led to place much stress upon schools whose curriculum shall include industrial training, as an agency in civilizing and Christianizing the African race.

The principal races of pagan Africa are the Negro and the Bantu, the former occupying the greater part of Western and of Northern Central Africa, the latter including most of the tribes south of the equator, or those in the region of the great lakes, in the basins of the Congo and Zambezi rivers, and in the Zulu and Kafir lands. The Hottentots and Bushmen of South Africa represent a subordinate group. Certain tribes in the Soudan and northern Africa may also be assigned to a distinct class. As respects the religion of pagan Africans, fetichism, demon worship, witchcraft, and fear of the spells which witchcraft is believed to impose, are the principal ingredients. As Mohammedanism has held possession of North Africa since the seventh century, its union of the military and missionary spirit has naturally occasioned considerable inroads upon the native tribes. It has numerous adherents in the Soudan, and is also represented on both the eastern and western coasts. Altogether the Mohammedans are supposed to constitute about one fourth the total population of the continent.

The Indians in America, aggregating at a recent date, in the limits of the United States, exclusive of Alaska, 250,000, in the Canadian provinces about 125,000, and constituting also a considerable body in South America, have afforded continuous occasion for arduous missionary effort. If the occasion has not been adequately met, it has at least been fulfilled in a degree which implies a vast sum of toil and sacrifice. The missionary societies of the principal Churches very soon after their organization began to send their messengers to

the aborigines. The American Board despatched its first missionary, Cyrus Kingsbury, to the Cherokees in 1815. Between this date and the year 1883 its agents have labored for a longer or shorter period within many other tribes, namely: the Choctaws, Osages, Maumees, Mackinaws, Chickasaws, Stockbridges, Creeks, Pawnees, Oregons, Senecas, Tuscaroras, Ojibways, and Dakotas. Representatives of the Baptist Home Missionary Society have also labored among numerous tribes. Since 1816, when John Stewart preached to an audience of one old squaw among the Wyandots on the Upper Sandusky, the Methodist Episcopal Church has had its agents among the Indians. The Protestant Episcopal Church began work among the Oneidas in 1815, but a large part of its activity in behalf of the aborigines has been subsequent to 1860, when a mission was started among the Sioux. A part of the effort expended by these and other instrumentalities has been despoiled of its proper fruit by the removal of tribes and by hostilities into which they have been seduced or provoked. Nevertheless above twenty thousand Indian church members were reported in 1890. In Canada the labors of the Wesleyans, the Presbyterians, and the Church of England have been attended with much encouragement. The Wesleyans numbered recently nearly five thousand Indian communicants.

Among the aborigines of South America the most interesting trophy of missionary zeal in the nineteenth century is the work which has been accomplished in Tierra del Fuego. Captain Allen Gardiner was the first to interest himself in the fierce savages of this region. His personal efforts there were a total failure,

and ended in the death of himself and companions by exposure and starvation (1850, 1851). But the example of his devotion had not been fruitless. Others were stirred to take up his work. With the Falkland Islands as a basis of operations, communication was gradually made with Tierra del Fuego. In 1859 a missionary company who ventured to trust themselves to the mercy of the natives were ruthlessly massacred. Nevertheless the field was not abandoned, and ten years later labors were begun at Ooshooia, which have transformed that place into a Christian village. Over this achievement Charles Darwin wrote these strong words of appreciation: "The success of the Tierra del Fuego mission is most wonderful, and charms me, as I had always prophesied utter failure. It is a grand success."

The kingdom of Christ has attained a great extension in the islands of the sea through a century of missionary toil. In the West Indies the beginnings of Methodist piety which had been fostered by lay evangelists received a notable reinforcement in 1786, when four storm-driven men took refuge in Antigua. These men were Coke, Hammett, Warrener, and Clarke. So great appeared the need of the gospel message and so favorable the hearing which was accorded to it, that labor was begun forthwith, not only in Antigua but also in several others of the West Indian group.

The Society Islands, in the Southern Pacific were visited by missionaries of the London Society in 1797. For a number of years very little progress was made toward the conversion of the natives. But the tide

changed between 1812 and 1815. Not long thereafter idolatry had been renounced by the inhabitants of Tahiti, and their example was followed by other islands in the group.

The Tonga or Friendly Islands were entered by Wesleyan missionaries in 1822. The ultimate result was the Christianizing of the islands and the establishment of a Church which both supports itself and gives to outside interests. From this group the Wesleyans in 1835 began efforts to evangelize the Fiji Islands, the notorious haunts of cannibalism and every form of cruel savagery. By degrees the great body of the people were led to assent to the Christian faith, and twenty thousand of them were enrolled as church members.

A like transformation was wrought in the Hawaiian or Sandwich Islands. When the missionaries of the American Board landed in 1820 they found the people in a remarkable degree prepared for their message, having by their own motion cast off the yoke of their idolatries. In the great revival which began in 1828, and ran through six years, twenty-seven thousand persons were added to the churches. This represents the acme of progress. Vices brought in by a great swarm of immoral sailors and adventurers have caused a decline in population and darkened somewhat the bright prospects which so suddenly broke upon these lands.

In New Zealand the Church Missionary Society began work in 1814, and was followed in 1822 by the Wesleyans. Since the middle of the century missionary enterprise has been carried on in the New Hebrides and in Micronesia, including the Gilbert, Marshall, and Caroline Islands. In all these fields large sacrifices

have been rewarded with a fair measure of success. Not the least of the sacrifices was the death, through native violence, of John Coleridge Patteson, the courageous and earnest bishop of Melanesia.

The history of Christianity in Madagascar makes a notable chapter as being a record of fiery trial and great triumphs. The first Protestant evangelists sent out by the London Society reached the island in 1818. The King Radama was well-disposed; by his favor many schools were established, and Christianity rapidly advanced in the appreciation of the people. But under his successor, Queen Ranavalona (1828–1861) a reaction took place, Christianity was put under the ban, its adherents were treated with Neronian rigor, and had an opportunity to glorify their cause by a long roll of martyrs. The infatuated persecution failed utterly of its end; and the successor of Ranavalona, with better insight into the condition of affairs, granted toleration. Ramoma, who came to the throne in 1868 under the title of Ranavalona II. reigned as a Christian queen. By her command the royal idols were destroyed. Her successor being of like spirit, Protestant Christianity, though embarrassed in no small measure by French intervention, has continued to exert a powerful influence in Madagascar.

In 1890 the number of Protestant communicants in the mission field was in the neighborhood of three quarters of a million. This of course implies a much larger number who are more or less distinctly under Christian teaching and guidance. Considering their wide distribution, considering also the quickened intellectual

life and the rapid development of Christian literature which have followed in the path of Protestant heralds, and which promise increasing results in the future, we may well affirm that the missionary enterprise of Protestantism in the nineteenth century cannot easily be paralleled. Roman Catholics may indeed report a somewhat larger body of adherents in India and China. But their missions in these countries date back to the sixteenth century. In the rate of increase of converts during recent years, and in vitality and pervasiveness of influence, the missionary work of Protestantism has advanced beyond that of its rival.

The limits of our sketch have confined us to scanty outlines. Had we taken space for a more interior view of missionary enterprise, we should have made it evident that instances of heroic faith and fidelity, such as shed a halo over the early years of Christian history, have not been wanting in these latter days. Often has the Christian name been signally honored by the native convert as well as by the missionary.

A singular episode, not without its missionary bearing, occurred in connection with the Columbian exposition at Chicago in 1893. The "World's Parliament of Religions," as then convened, was in essence a great religious exhibition. It served in a measure to reflect the religious world, but evidently not with entire accuracy. The circumstances of the occasion naturally afforded a temptation for the element of advertisement to outrun that of unprejudiced, judicial description.

The temporary appearance on the same stage of representatives of different systems — Christian, Jewish,

Mohammedan, Buddhist, Brahmanical, Parsi, and Confucian — was not a sufficiently vital means of interaction to effect any very profound or noticeable results within the limits of these systems. The meeting, however, may be credited with having enlarged somewhat, among Christian people, the area of intelligent interest in the ethnic religions. Possibly, also, as respects the relations of Christians to each other, it may have effected something in behalf of inter-denominational friendship.

CONCLUSION.

A WELL-KNOWN writer has remarked recently on the descent which we are obliged to make when we turn from Christ to the Church. The remark is not ill-founded. A large part of Christian history manifestly has been far beneath the level of the Gospels.

The tenor of Christ's ministry was to sweep away barriers, and to apprise men of the open doors which stood before them. Every page of His discourse illustrates the immediateness of the divine. The burden of His message was God's ready welcome to repentant sinners, the nearness of the kingdom of heaven to all who have a heart to enter therein. Immediateness, nearness, accessibility of the divine, — that is the illuminating feature of Christ's teaching.

It is not too much to say that large portions of ecclesiastical history present well-nigh the opposite of this. Great masses of Christian subjects have been placed under a system whose natural tendency has been to cancel all sense of the immediateness of the divine, by reason of the legal and sacerdotal elements which have been crowded into the foreground. In place of an open door being set before him, the seeker after God has been instructed to contemplate a series of closed doors, guarded each by a priestly custodian, and swinging open only as he deigns to speak the appointed for-

mula. Instead of the competency of simple heart instrumentality to press directly into the kingdom of heaven, dependence upon a complicated scheme of external magic has been inculcated. Instead of opening their minds to the sunlight of revelation, the faithful have been required to content themselves with such reflected rays as might come from the official understanding. As if one world did not provide a sufficient theatre for ecclesiastical machinery, an attachment has been laid on a second, and a scheme, thoroughly mundane in some of its constituents, has been worked out for the promotion of departed souls.

On the other hand, revolt against this overgrowth of legalism and sacerdotalism has not always been conducted with discretion. Zeal for the essential has precipitated a hasty dealing with that which may be useful though secondary. It has been overlooked that things which are justly counted intolerable, when they are understood to represent ceremonial magic and priestly assumption, may be allowed without scruple when understood to subserve simply an æsthetic or social end. Thus a greater degree of austerity and plainness has sometimes been given to public worship than is best suited to devotion, at least in a considerable proportion of minds; or losses have been incurred as respects effective union and co-operation.

It is no undue tribute to pessimism to recognize this shadowed side of Christian history. An honest account of the facts requires the recognition. It is fitting, however, to remind ourselves that this is by no means the whole scene. In a work like this no adequate narrative can be given of the blessings of Chris-

tianity. As secular history makes but moderate account of intervals of peace, and fills a large share of its pages with stories of armed conflicts, because of the prominence with which these stand out in the memorials of the past, so church history takes comparatively little note of the treasure which Christianity, even in the least favored ages, has brought to multitudes of humble believers, and occupies itself largely with accounts of controversies, struggles, and perversions. Could the historian lift the veil from the hearths and the hearts where the truths of the gospel and the hopes which it inspires have cast their light and cheer, it would be sufficiently manifest that it has accomplished in no small degree its design to bring in the kingdom of heaven. In the more public sphere also Christianity has achieved enough to warrant anticipations of large and substantial victories in the coming age. It has revealed such an immense and perennial vitality as properly to encourage faith in its ability to supply out of its own resources the reformatory instrumentalities which are needed to correct the work of human limitation and perversity. If the darkness is here the light contends with the darkness; and the light has a strong ally, for "God is light and in Him is no darkness at all."

A P P E N D I X.

A P P E N D I X.

I.

THE BULL UNIGENITUS ON THE READING OF THE SCRIPTURES.

The tenor of this *ex cathedra* manifesto is unmistakably in the line of rebuke and prohibition of the general reading of the Scriptures. It condemns the following propositions :

80. *Lectio sacræ Scripturæ est pro omnibus.*

81. *Obscuritas Sancti Verbi Dei non est laicis ratio dispensandi se ipsos ab ejus lectione.*

82. *Dies Dominicus à Christianis debet sanctificari lectiōnibus pietatis, et super omnia Sanctarum Scriptuarum. Damnosum est velle Christianum ab hac lectione retrahere.*

83. *Est illusio, sibi persuadere, quod notitia mysteriorum religionis non debeat communicari fœminis lectione Sacrorum Librorum. Non ex fœminarum simplicitate, sed ex superba virorum scientia, ortus est*

The reading of sacred Scripture is for all.

The obscurity of the Holy Word of God is no reason why the laity should release themselves from its perusal.

The Lord's Day ought to be sanctified on the part of Christians by pious reading, and above all by the perusal of the Holy Scriptures. It is harmful to wish to keep back a Christian from this reading.

It is an illusion to persuade one's self that a knowledge of the mysteries of religion ought not to be communicated to women by a reading of the Sacred Books. Not from the simplicity of women, but from the vain-

Scriptuarum abusus, et natæ sunt hæreses.

84. Abripere è Christianorum manibus Novum Testamentum, seu eis illud clausum tenere, auferendo eis modum illud intelligendi, est illis Christi os obturare.

85. Interdicere Christianis lectionem sacrae Scripturæ, præsertim Evangelii, est interdicere usum luminis filiis lucis, ut patiantur speciem quandam excommunicationis.

glorious knowledge of men, abuse of the Scriptures has arisen, and heresies have sprung up.

To snatch away the New Testament from the hands of Christians, or to keep it closed to them, amounts to closing the mouth of Christ to them by taking away from them that method of gaining knowledge.

To interdict to Christians the reading of Holy Scripture, especially of the Gospel, is to interdict the use of light to the sons of light, and to cause them to endure a species of excommunication.

To the ordinary reader it is not clear why the apostolic malediction hurled against some of these sentences must not, in good logic, be regarded as smiting this language which the fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore included in their Pastoral Letter: "It can hardly be necessary for us to remind you, beloved brethren, that the most highly valued treasure of every family library, and the most frequently and lovingly made use of, should be the Holy Scriptures." (Acta et Decreta, p. lxxxix.)

II.

POPES AND EMPERORS.

Date of Accession.	Popes.	Emperors.
1493		Maximilian I.
1513	Leo X.	
1519		Charles V.
1522	Adrian VI.	
1523	Clement VII.	
1534	Paul III.	
1550	Julius III.	
1555	Marcellus II.	
1555	Paul IV.	
1556		Ferdinand I.
1559	Pius IV.	
1564		Maximilian II.
1566	Pius V.	
1572	Gregory XIII.	
1576		Rudolf II.
1585	Sixtus V.	
1590	Urban VII.	
1590	Gregory XIV.	
1591	Innocent IX.	
1592	Clement VIII.	
1605	Leo XI.	
1605	Paul V.	
1612		Matthias.
1619		Ferdinand II.
1621	Gregory XV.	
1623	Urban VIII.	
1637		Ferdinand III.
1644	Innocent X.	
1655	Alexander VII.	

Date of Accession.	Popes.	Emperors.
1657	Leopold I.
1667	Clement IX.	
1670	Clement X.	
1676	Innocent XI.	
1689	Alexander VIII.	
1691	Innocent XII.	
1700	Clement XI.	
1705	Joseph I.
1711	Charles VI.
1721	Innocent XIII.	
1724	Benedict XIII.	
1730	Clement XII.	
1740	Benedict XIV.	Maria Theresa and Francis I.
1758	Clement XIII.	
1765	Maria Theresa and Joseph II.
1769	Clement XIV.	
1775	Pius VI.	
1780	Joseph II.
1790	Leopold II.
1792	Francis II.
1800	Pius VII.	
1806	Empire dissolved.
1814	German Confederation.
1823	Leo XII.	
1829	Pius VIII.	
1831	Gregory XVI.	
1846	Pius IX.	
1866	North German Confederation.
1870	New German Empire under William I. of Prussia.
1878	Leo XIII.	
1888	Frederic III.
1888	William II.

INDEX OF THE MODERN CHURCH.

[The number of the volume is omitted in references to Volume I., except where it is required to prevent ambiguity.]

- ABSOLUTION, in relation to parents patronizing the public schools, iii. 317 ff.
Absolutism, climax of papal, iii. 64 ff.
Acadia, ii. 136 f., 141 f.
Addison, Joseph, ii. 30.
Address to the Colonies, Wesley's, iii. 87.
Adopting Act, ii. 256 ff.
Adrian VI., 129, 355.
Adventists, iii. 342 f.
African Methodist Episcopal Church, iii. 286.
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, iii. 286.
Agnosticism, iii. 174, 218 f.
Agricola, Rudolf, 17.
Albert, Archbishop of Mayence, 57.
Alcott, A. B., iii. 254.
Alexander IV., Pope, 368.
Alexander VI., ii. 126 f., 181.
Alexander VIII., 388 f., 417, 487, 520.
Alexander I., of Russia, ii. 445 ff.
Alexander II., iii. 374 f.
Alexander III., iii. 375.
Alexander, Natalis, 473.
Alexander, of Parma, 247 f.
Alford, Henry, iii. 135.
Algieri, 220.
Allan, William, iii. 187.
Allen, William, 307.
Alva, Duke of, 242 ff.
Alzog, J., 63 f.
Amboise, Tumult of, 189.
America, the Colonies in, viewed as to their political relations, ii. 126 ff.; the Colonies in their relations to the natives, 158 ff.; ecclesiastical and religious developments in the colonial era, 181 ff.; developments since the colonial era, iii. 222 ff.
Amherst College, iii. 229.
Amyraut, Moïse, 601.
Anabaptists, 41, 87 ff., 101 f.
Anderson, Lawrence, 116 f.
Andover Seminary, iii. 263, 268 ff.
Andréä, Jacob, 605.
Andréä, J. V., 581 f.
Andrew, Bishop, iii. 241 f.
Anglo-Catholic scheme, developed in time of Laud, 338 f.; approached by the Nonjurors, ii. 2 ; adopted in some of its features by the Tractarians, iii. 139 ff.
Anna Ivanovna, ii. 443.
Anne, Queen, reign of, 572 ff.
Annet, Peter, ii. 16.
Anthony, of the house of Bourbon, 181.
Anthony of Lebrija, 14.
Anti-Cotton, 411.
Anti-Mission Baptists, iii. 291.
Antinomian controversy, ii. 229 ff.
Anton, Paul, 591 f.
Antonelli, Cardinal, iii. 11.
Antrim, Presbytery of, ii. 124.
Apostolicum, the bull, ii. 332.
Aquaviva, 410, 427.
Argentine Republic, iii. 368.
Arianism, ii. 98 f., 102, iii. 207, 251.
Aristotle, 55.
Armada, the Grand, 309, 317.
Armenians, 605, iii. 381.
Arminianism, 250 ff., 340, 345.
Arminians, 250 ff.
Arminius, James, 250 f.
Arnauld, Angélique, 488.
Arnauld, Antoine, 489, 502.
Arndt, John, 581 f.
Arnold, Gottfried, 583 f.
Arnold, Matthew, iii. 171, 175 ff.
Arnold, Thomas, iii. 133, 138, 166 f.
Arthur, William, iii. 181.

- Asbury, Francis, ii. 70, 270 f., 274, 276 f.
 Ascue, Anne, 279.
 Associate Presbytery, ii. 106, 108.
 Associate Reformed Church, ii. 261.
 Assurance, Wesley's doctrine of, ii. 75 f.
 Attrition, doctrine of, 424, 492 f.
 Audiencia, ii. 132.
 Augsburg Confession, 98 f.
 Augsburg, Council of, in 1548, 431.
 Augsburg, Diet of, in 1530, 97 f.
 Augsburg, Peace of, 109 f.
 Augustine, 49, 54, 484 ff., ii. 348, iii. 97.
 Austria, 363, 520 f., ii. 365 ff., iii. 2 ff., 42, 106, 123 f.
 Auto de fé, 227 ff., 517.
 Aztecs, ii. 128, 160 ff.
- BAADEK, Franz von, 581.
 Babington, Anthony, 308.
 Babylonish Captivity, a writing by Luther, 75 f.
 Backus, Isaac, ii. 265.
 Bacon, Francis, 317, ii. 389.
 Baden, iii. 106 f.
 Bailly, iii. 71, 78.
 Baines, Bishop, iii. 69.
 Bale, John, 353.
 Ballou, Hosea, iii. 258.
 Baltimore, Lord; see Calvert.
 Bancroft, Archbishop, 316 f.
 Bancroft, H. H., ii. 165 ff.
 Baptism, iii. 294 f.
 Baptists, in England, 527, 529, ii. 97, 102 ff., iii. 182 ff.; in America, ii. 198 f., 228, 231 ff., 261 ff., 288, iii. 291 ff., 341, 350 ff., 356.
 Barclay, Robert, ii. 267 f.
 Baring-Gould, S., iii. 153.
 Barnes, Albert, iii. 272 f.
 Barnes, Robert, 265 f., 279.
 Barneveldt, 253 f.
 Barrow, Isaac, 558 f.
 Barrowe, Henry, 312.
 Basecom, H. B., iii. 289.
 Baumgarten, S. J., iii. 394.
 Baumgartner, Augustus, 432.
 Baur, F. C., iii. 24 f.
 Bausset, Cardinal, 425.
 Bavaria, 363, 438, 442.
 Bayle, Peter, 482 ff.
 Baxter, Richard, 540, 556 f.
 Bazard, iii. 130.
 Beaton, Cardinal, 318, 320.
 Beecher, H. W., iii. 267.
 Beecher, Lyman, iii. 244, 260 f., 272.
 Bedell, William, 354.
 Beethoven, ii. 432.
 Behmenists, 526.
 Bellarmin, Robert, 374, 387, 411, iii. 48, 95.
 Bellows, H. W., iii. 257.
 Belsham, Thomas, ii. 99.
 Benedict XIII., ii. 321.
 Benedict XIV., 406 f., ii. 321, 378, 382.
 Benezet, Anthony, ii. 287.
 Bengel, J. A., ii. 398 f.
 Bennett, C. W., iii. 290.
 Benson, Joseph, ii. 82 f., iii. 180 f.
 Bentham, Jeremy, iii. 212.
 Bentley, Richard, ii. 20.
 Bergier, iii. 78.
 Berkeley, George, ii. 26, 123, 206.
 Berkeley, William, ii. 200 f.
 Bernard Délicienx, 378.
 Berridge, John, ii. 93.
 Bert, Paul, iii. 129.
 Beza, Theodore, 149, 191.
 Bible; see Scriptures.
 Biddle, John, 527.
 Biedermann, A. E., iii. 35.
 Bilderdijk, iii. 38.
 Billets de confession, ii. 323 f.
 Bilney, Thomas, 265 f.
 Bismarck, iii. 3 ff., 16.
 Black, William, iii. 346.
 Blair, Hugh, ii. 109.
 Blair, James, ii. 197.
 Bledsoe, A. T., iii. 290.
 Bleukinsopp, E. L., iii. 151 f.
 Blount, Charles, ii. 11.
 Blue laws, ii. 151.
 Boardman, Richard, ii. 269, 277.
 Boccaccio, 11.
 Boehler, Peter, ii. 45.
 Boehm, Martin, ii. 252.
 Boehme, Jacob, 580 f., ii. 6.
 Boes, Henry, 235.
 Bogatzky, K. H. von, ii. 400.
 Bohemia, 364, 440 ff., 449.
 Boileau, 464.
 Boleyn, Anne, 270, 273.
 Bolingbroke, ii. 18 f.
 Bolivia, iii. 369.
 Bolsec, 157.
 Bonaventura, 54.
 Bonner, Bishop, 289, 300.
 Bonnet, Jules, 215.
 Bonomelli, Bishop, iii. 126.
 Book of Common Prayer, 282 ff., 304, iii. 140, 150.
 Booth, Abraham, ii. 104.
 Borromeo, Carlo, 364.

- Bossuet, 51 f., 428, 467 ff., 470 ff., 512, 588.
 Boston, Thomas, ii. 112.
 Bothwell, 327.
 Bourdaloue, 469.
 Bourignon, Antoinette, 600 f.
 Bouvier, iii. 78.
 Bowne, B. P., iii. 291.
 Boyle, Robert, ii. 178.
 Boyne, battle of the, 554.
 Bradbury, Thomas, 575, ii. 100.
 Braganza, house of, ii. 134.
 Brahmanism, iii. 387 f.
 Brainerd, David, ii. 180.
 Braithwaite, John, 558.
 Brantôme, 197.
 Bray, James, ii. 197.
 Brazil, ii. 133 f., iii. 369 ff.
 Brébeuf, 408.
 Breithaupt, 592.
 Breviary, the Roman, iii. 80 ff.
 Briçonnet, 172 f.
 Briggs, C. A., iii. 278 f.
 Bright, John, iii. 187.
 Brine, John, ii. 103.
 British Critic, the, iii. 146.
 British North American Act, iii. 348.
 Broad Church, iii. 133, 164 ff.
 Brooks, Phillips, iii. 302.
 Broughton, Thomas, ii. 36, 39.
 Brown, Robert, 312.
 Brownson, O. A., iii. 326 ff.
 Bruce, A. B., iii. 201.
 Brucioli, Antonio, 210.
 Bruno, Giordano, 383 f., ii. 400.
 Bryce, James, iii. 230 f.
 Bucer, Martin, 103, 165, 282.
 Buckley, J. M., iii. 288.
 Buddæus, William, 14.
 Buddhism, iii. 387 f., 396 ff.
 Bulgaria, iii. 380 f.
 Bull, George, 558 f.
 Bullinger, Henry, 136 ff., 166.
 Bunting, Jabez, iii. 181.
 Bunyan, John, 553, 557 f.
 Burnet, Gilbert, 296, 520, 569, ii. 27.
 Burns, Francis, iii. 402.
 Burnyeat, John, ii. 266.
 Burton, J. H., ii. 109 f.
 Busenbaum, 421 f.
 Bushnell, Horace, iii. 206 f.
 Butler, Joseph, ii. 20 f., 29.
 Butler, William, iii. 393.
- CABALISM**, 18.
- Caird, Edward, iii. 221.
 Caird, John, iii. 218 f.
- Cairns, John, iii. 221.
 Cajetan, 65 ff.
 Calamy, Edmund, 573.
 Calderwood, Henry, iii. 221.
 California, ii. 130.
 Calixtus, George, 584 ff.
 Calmet, Augustine, ii. 382.
 Calvert, Cecil, ii. 146, 153, 189 ff.
 Calvert, George, ii. 146.
 Calvin, John, his birth and education, 143 ff.; his espousal of the Reformation and first writing in its behalf, 144 f.; estimate of him as man and theologian, 145 ff.; his part in the government of the Genevan Church and Society, 152 ff.; relation to the tragic fate of Servetus, 157 ff.; influence outside of Geneva, 163 ff.
 Cambridge, reform movement at, 265; school of Platonists, 560 f.
 Cambridge Platform, ii. 219.
 Cameronians, 578.
 Camisards, 515.
 Campbell, George, ii. 109.
 Campbell, Macleod, iii. 198.
 Campbellites, iii. 295 f.
 Camp-meetings, their origin, iii. 227.
 Canada, ii. 137 ff., 171 ff., 185 ff., iii. 343 ff.
 Cano, Melchior, 411, iii. 94.
 Cappadose, iii. 38.
 Caraffa, 212, 217.
 Carey, William, ii. 103 f., iii. 389 ff.
 Carlstadt, 69, 88.
 Carlyle, Thomas, ii. 309 f., 385, iii. 193, 195, 199 ff.
 Carnesecchi, Pietro, 221.
 Carolinas, the, ii. 146 f., 153, 158, 196, 201 f.
 Carranza, 223, 291.
 Carroll, H. K., iii. 343.
 Carroll, John, ii. 196.
 Carteret, Sir George, ii. 147.
 Cartwright, Thomas, 311.
 Castelar, iii. 63.
 Castellio, 157, 162.
 Catharine, of Aragon, 269 f., 273.
 Catharine de Medici, 188, 191, 194, 196 f., 199, 202.
 Catharine II., of Russia, ii. 335, 444 f., 447.
 Catholic Apostolic Church, iii. 196.
 Catholic Association, in Germany, iii. 77.
 Cavour, iii. 124.
 Ceceoni, iii. 73, 83, 107.
 Cecil, Richard, ii. 94.

- Cecil, Sir William, 303, 306.
 Celibacy, clerical, 302, 430 ff., 609 f., ii. 353.
 Central America, ii. 128, iii. 365 f.
 Chaldaeans, iii. 381.
 Chalmers, Thomas, iii. 191 ff.
 Champlain, ii. 137, 140.
 Chandler, Edward, ii. 20.
 Chandler, Samuel, ii. 20.
 Channing, W. E., iii. 249 ff.
 Chapman, John, ii. 20.
 Charles VI., of Austria, ii. 374.
 Charles I., of England, 334, 337 ff., 523 f.
 Charles II., of England, 524, 536 ff., ii. 150, 152, 235 f.
 Charles IX., of France, 196 f., 199 f., 202.
 Charles V., Emperor of Germany, 37 f., 43, 79, 82 f., 97 ff., 107 ff., 231, 234 ff.
 Charles III., of Spain, ii. 380; Charles IV., ii. 381.
 Charles IX., of Sweden, 118 f.
 Charles Albert, of Piedmont, iii. 124.
 Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine, 179 f., 192.
 Charles, Thomas, of Bala, ii. 61 f.
 Charter governments, ii. 149 ff.
 Charterhouse monks, 275.
 Chateaubriand, ii. 382.
 Châtellain, Jean, 175.
 Chauncy, Charles, ii. 232.
 Chautauqua system, iii. 289.
 Cheminot, 429.
 Chesterfield, ii. 30, 57.
 Chili, iii. 267 f.
 Chillingworth, William, 346 ff.
 China, Roman Catholic missions in, 407; Protestant missions, iii. 396 ff.
 Christadelphians, iii. 343.
 Christian II., of Denmark, 114.
 Christian III., 115.
 Christian IV., 442, 444.
 Christian Endeavor, Societies of, iii. 270.
 Christian Missionary Association, iii. 343.
 Christians, the denomination of, iii. 343.
 Christian Scientists, iii. 343.
 Christina, ex-Queen of Sweden, 519 f.
 Chubb, Thomas, ii. 18.
 Church constitution, views of Luther respecting, 95, 453; Calvin's views, 153 f.; peculiarity of the English establishment, 261; Puritan theories, 310 ff., 344; developments in Scotland, 328 ff., 576 ff., ii. 105 f., iii. 190 f.; Moravian polity, i. 597 f.; organization given to his societies by John Wesley, ii. 64 ff.; theories in Puritan New England, ii. 214 ff.; more recent developments among Lutherans, iii. 6 ff., 307.
 Church of England, 273 f., 281 ff., 303 ff., 314 ff., 528 f., 531, 538 ff., 541, 567 ff., ii. 1 ff., 26 ff., 93 f., 120 ff., 196 ff., iii. 132 ff.
 Church of God, iii. 279, 342.
 Church and State, their relation in the United States, iii. 222 ff.
 Church Triumphant, iii. 343.
 City mission-work, new impulse in, iii. 136.
 Civil Constitution of the Clergy, ii. 343 ff.
 Civiltà Cattolica, iii. 60, 68, 99, 104, 117.
 Clarendon, Earl of, 533.
 Clarke, Adam, ii. 89, iii. 180 f.
 Clarke, J. F., iii. 258.
 Clarke, Samuel, ii. 98.
 Claude, John, 551.
 Claudius, Matthias, ii. 400 f.
 Clayton, John, ii. 37 f.
 Clement VI., Pope, 66.
 Clement VII., 271 f., 355 f., 603.
 Clement XI., 502 f., ii. 320 f., 377 f.
 Clement XII., ii. 326, 381.
 Clement XIII., ii. 327 f., 331 ff., 372, 378.
 Clement XIV., 411, ii. 333 f., 378 f.
 Clement, Jacques, 205.
 Coccejus, 599 f.
 Coke, Thomas, ii. 70, 273, iii. 180.
 Cokesbury College, ii. 276.
 Colani, iii. 37.
 Colbert, 505.
 Colenso, Bishop, iii. 175 f.
 Coleridge, S. T., iii. 132 f., 166, 172, 204.
 Collet, John, 14.
 Coligny, Admiral, 182 f., 195 ff., ii. 135.
 Collegia Pietatis, 590.
 Collier, Jeremy, ii. 3.
 Collins, Anthony, ii. 14 f., 20.
 Cologne, Council of, in 1527, 431.
 Colombia, iii. 369.
 Colonial Bishoprics, iii. 136.
 Columbus, Christopher, ii. 126, 128, 163.
 Communistic societies, iii. 339 f., 343.
 Comte, Auguste, iii. 130, 199.
 Conant, T. J., iii. 294.

- Concordats, between the Pope and Napoleon I., ii. 357 ff.; with Austria and other states, iii. 106 f., 109.
 Confession, the Augsburg, 98; the Second Helvetic, 166; the French, 186; the Scotch, 330; the Westminister, 344 f.
 Confessional, the, 415, 428 f., 434 f.
 Confessional School, iii. 27 f.
 Confucianism, iii. 396 f.
 Congregationalists, in England, 312 f., 344 f., 529, iii. 100 ff., iii. 184 f.; in America, ii. 149 ff., 198, 213 ff., 287, iii. 223 f., 260 ff., 342, 350, 356.
 Connecticut Colony, ii. 145, 150 ff., 175, 221, 285.
 Connolly, Archbishop, iii. 96.
 Consalvi, ii. 357.
 Consistory, 153 f., iii. 6.
 Constitutional Clergy, ii. 349 f.
 Contarini, 212.
 Conventicle Act, 542.
 Convulsionnaires, ii. 325.
 Conybeare, John, ii. 20, 24 f.
 Cooke, Henry, iii. 207.
 Cop, Nicolas, 141.
 Copernican theory, 1, 384 ff.
 Coquerel, iii. 37.
 Corneille, 464.
 Corporation Act, 542, ii. 96, iii. 134.
 Cortés, Hernando, ii. 128, 163.
 Cosin, John, 558.
 Cotton, John, ii. 223 f., 229.
 Coughlan, John, iii. 346.
 Council of Blood, 244 f.
 Council of the Indies, ii. 131, 181.
 Court of High Commission, 304.
 Cousin, Victor, 501.
 Covenant, the, 342.
 Covenanters, 578, ii. 261.
 Cowper, William, ii. 94.
 Cox, M. B., iii. 402.
 Cramp, J. M., ii. 102 f., 264.
 Cranmer, Thomas, 273, 297 ff.
 Crewdson, Isaac, iii. 186.
 Criticism, Biblical, 481 f., ii. 12 ff., 387 f., 395 ff., 413 ff., 440, iii. 21 ff., 34, 162 ff., 175 ff., 201, 278 f.
 Cromwell, Oliver, 524 ff.
 Cromwell, Richard, 535.
 Cromwell, Thomas, 275.
 Crooks, G. R., iii. 290.
 Crowther, Samuel, iii. 401.
 Crusius, Martin, 605 f.
 Cudworth, Ralph, 560 f.
 Cullen, Paul, iii. 202 f.
 Cumberland Presbyterians, iii. 270 f.
 Cumming, Patrick, ii. 107.
 Cummins, G. D., iii. 301.
 Curcellæus, Stephan, ii. 442.
 Cyril Lucar, 606 f.
 DA COSTA, iii. 38.
 Dale, R. W., iii. 185.
 D'Alembert, ii. 311 f.
 D'Andelot, 182.
 Dante, 10.
 Darboy, Archbishop, iii. 86.
 Darby, John, iii. 188.
 D'Argenson, Marquis, ii. 292 f., 301 f., 328.
 Darnley, Lord, 326 f.
 Darwinian theory, iii. 208 ff.
 D'Aubigné, Agrippa, 207.
 D'Aubigné, Merle, 100, 122, iii. 36.
 Davies, Howell, ii. 33.
 Davies, Samuel, ii. 260.
 Deaconesses, iii. 17, 288.
 De Berquin, Louis, 172, 174, 176.
 De Castro, Alphonso, 291.
 Declaration of the French Clergy in 1682, 471 f.
 Declaration of Indulgence, by James II., 547, 553.
 De Cock, H., iii. 39.
 De Foe, Daniel, 573 f.
 Deed of Declaration, ii. 73.
 Deism, ii. 9 ff., 303.
 De Groot, Hofstede, iii. 39.
 D'Holbach, ii. 311.
 De la Fuente, Constantine Ponce, 225 f.
 Delaware, ii. 147.
 De Lerma, Pedro, 225.
 De Maintenon, Madame, 463.
 De Maistre, Joseph, iii. 75, 77.
 Demetrius, the False, 603.
 De Monts, ii. 137.
 Dempster, John, iii. 233, 290.
 Denmark, 114 f., iii. 40 f.
 De Noailles, Cardinal, 503.
 De Pressensé, Edmund, ii. 364, iii. 37.
 De Roxas, Domingo, 229 f.
 Des Adrets, Baron, 168 f.
 De Sales, Francis, 364 f.
 Descartes, 504, ii. 389.
 De Seso, Don Carlos, 229 f., 232.
 De Sévigné, Madame, 512.
 De Staél, Madame, ii. 300, 356 f.
 De Thou, 169, 182, 187, 190, 193, 200, 234, 245.
 De Ulloa, Juan Francisco, ii. 185.
 De Valer, Rodrigo, 225.
 De Virves, 224 f.
 De Wette, W. M. L., ii. 420 f.

- Dexter, H. M., ii. 215, 218, 228, 233, iii. 184.
 Dickinson, Jonathan, ii. 255 f.
 Didacus a Stunica, 386.
 Directory, the French, ii. 300, 347.
 Directory, the Westminster Assembly's, 544.
 Disciples of Christ, iii. 295 f., 342.
 Dissenters, the English, 312 f., 541 ff., 533, 564, 572 ff., ii. 95 ff., iii. 134 f., 179 ff.
 Divorce, the famous case of Henry VIII., 269 ff.
 Dober, Leonhard, iii. 384.
 Doddridge, Philip, ii. 100 ff.
 Dodwell, Henry, ii. 3.
 Dodwell, Jr., Henry, ii. 19.
 Döllinger, Ignaz von, 106 f., iii. 73, 81, 95, 100 ff.
 Domenech, Abbé, iii. 361 f.
 Don Pedro II., iii. 369.
 Donauwerth, 439.
 Don John, of Austria, 247.
 Dorchester, Daniel, ii. 286, iii. 229 f., 290.
 Dorner, I. A., 53, iii. 23, 26.
 Dort, Synod of, 254 f.
 Doukhobortsy, the, ii. 449.
 Doyle, Bishop, iii. 69, 204.
 Dragonnades, the, 509 ff.
 Drey, S. von, iii. 72.
 Drummond, R. B., 27.
 Du Bourg, 185.
 Duff, Alexander, iii. 291 f.
 Dusfield, George, iii. 272.
 Duguet, J. J., ii. 318.
 Dunkers, or Dunkards, ii. 265, iii. 343.
 Duns Scotus, iii. 47.
 Dunster, Henry, ii. 232.
 Durbin, J. P., iii. 289 f.
 Dutch Reformed Church, ii. 249 ff., iii. 279, 342.
 Dwight, Timothy, iii. 227.
- EASTERN Church, 603 ff., ii. 8, 443 ff., iii. 374 ff.
 East India Company, iii. 389 f.
 Eck, Dr. (John Meyer), 63, 69 ff., 77, 99.
 Ecuador, iii. 366 f.
 Edelmann, ii. 395.
 Edmundson, William, ii. 74, 266.
 Education, claim for clerical control over, iii. 11, 106 ff., 110, 118 f., 129, 202 f., 315 ff., 359; State supervision, iii. 10 ff., 40, 108, 128 ff., 135, 224, 361.
- Edward VI., of England, 281 ff.
- Edwards, Jonathan, ii. 179, 240, 243 ff.
 Egede, Hans, iii. 385.
 Egidius, 225.
 Egmont, Count, 238, 243.
 Eichhorn, J. G., ii. 398.
 Eliot, John, ii. 177 f.
 Ellicott, C. J., iii. 135.
 Elizabeth, Queen of England, 301 ff.
 Elizabeth, of Russia, ii. 444.
 Embury, Philip, ii. 269.
 Emerson, R. W., iii. 254 ff.
 Emile, writing of Rousseau, ii. 312 ff.
 Emmons, Nathaniel, ii. 244, iii. 263 f.
 Empire, the German, its condition in the early part of the sixteenth century, 35 ff.; relations with the papacy, 42 f.; dissolution, ii. 368; restoration under Prussian headship, iii. 5.
 Encomienda system, ii. 164.
 Encyclopedia, edited by D'Alembert and others, iii. 311 f.
 Enfantin, iii. 130.
 England, in the time of Henry VIII., 258 ff.; of Edward VI., 281 ff.; of Mary (Tudor), 286 ff.; of Elizabeth, 301 ff.; of James I. and Charles I., 330 ff.; of Cromwell, 523 ff.; of Charles II., 536 ff.; of James II., 545 ff.; of William III., 563 ff.; of Anne, 571 ff.; in the eighteenth century, ii. 1 ff.; in the nineteenth century, iii. 132 ff.
 Enzinas, Francisco de, 222.
 Episcopal Church, in Scotland, 329 f., 342 f., 576 f.; in Ireland, iii. 205 f.; in America, ii. 209 ff., iii. 296 ff., 342.
 Episcopius, Simon, 254, iii. 442.
 Epworth League, iii. 289.
 Erasmus, 25 ff., 93, 112, 128, 176.
 Erastians, 344.
 Erfurt, University of, 46.
 Ernesti, J. A., ii. 396.
 Erskine, Ebenezer, ii. 105 f., 112.
 Erskine, Thomas, iii. 197 f.
 Esch, John, 235.
 Escobar, 423, 425.
 Essays and Reviews, iii. 170 f.
 Euler, ii. 401.
 Evangelical Alliance, iii. 188 f.
 Evangelical Association, iii. 342.
 Evangelical League, iii. 9.
 Evangelical School, in the English Church, ii. 93 f., iii. 132 f.
 Evangelical Union, 439.
 Evans, L. J., iii. 276 ff.
 Evolutionism, iii. 207 ff., 215 ff.
 Eymeric, 369 ff.

- FABER, F. W., iii. 55 f., 61, 147.
 Faber, Peter, 395, 431 f.
 Falk, Dr., iii. 14.
 Falkland, Lord, 346.
 Familists, 526.
 Farel, William, 140 ff.
 Febronius, ii. 371 f.
 Federal Constitution, its adoption, ii. 155; its prohibition of a national church establishment, iii. 222 f.
 Federal Theology, 599 f.
 Fénelon, 476 ff.
 Ferdinand I., Emperor, 110, 432.
 Ferdinand II., 438 ff.
 Ferdinand III., 520.
 Ferdinand VII., of Spain, ii. 380 f.
 Ferguson, Adam, ii. 109.
 Ferrar, Bishop, 293.
 Ferry, Jules, iii. 128.
 Feudalism, in Canada, ii. 139.
 Fichte, J. G., ii. 407 ff.
 Ficinus, 11.
 Fifth-Monarchy Men, 526 f.
 Filmer, Sir Robert, 539.
 Finney, C. G., iii. 264 ff.
 Firmin, Thomas, ii. 97.
 Fisher, Bishop, 275.
 Fisk, Wilbur, 282, 290.
 Fiske, John, ii. 175.
 Five Mile Act, 541.
 Flaminio, 212.
 Fletcher, J. W., ii. 81 ff.
 Fleury, Claude, 473.
 Fliedner, T., iii. 17.
 Flint, Robert, iii. 221.
 Florida, ii. 130 f., 133.
 Foscarini, 386.
 Foster, James, ii. 20, 22 f.
 Fourier, iii. 131.
 Fox, George, 530, ii. 266.
 Francis II., of Austria, ii. 374, 376.
 Francis I., of France, 14, 170 f., 177 f.
 Francis II., 188 f.
 Francis, Duke of Guise, 180, 192, 194 f.
 Franciscans, ii. 168, 172.
 Francke, A. H., 591 f.
 Frank, F. H. R., iii. 28.
 Franklin, Benjamin, ii. 56.
 Frederic II. (Hohenstaufen Emperor), 368.
 Frederic I., of Denmark, 115.
 Frederic III., of the Palatinate, 166.
 Frederic V., 441.
 Frederic II., of Prussia, ii. 335, 383 ff.
 Frederic, Elector of Saxony, 43 f.
 Frederic William I., of Prussia, ii. 383.
 Frederic William II., ii. 386.
 Frederic William III., ii. 386.
 Frederic William IV., iii. 2 f., 7 f., 105.
 Free Church of Scotland, iii. 191.
 Freedom, religious, 189, 239, 345 ff., 453 f., 566 f., 599, ii. 341 f., 384, iii. 111 f., 119 f.
 Frelinghuysen, Jacob, ii. 250.
 Freeman, James, iii. 248.
 Free Masonry, condemned by a papal bull in 1738, ii. 381.
 Free Religious Association, iii. 258.
 Free Will Baptists, ii. 264, iii. 341.
 French Colonies in America, ii. 134 ff., 171 ff.
 Freylingenhausen, ii. 400.
 Friedrich, J., iii., 58 f., 72, and often in the following pages.
 Friends; see Quakers.
 Friends of Light, iii. 8.
 Friends of the Temple, iii. 345.
 Fries, J. F., ii. 421.
 Frohschammer, J., iii. 79.
 Frontenac, Count, ii. 173.
 Frothingham, O. B., iii. 253.
 Froude, J. A., 231 f., 276, 279, 319.
 Froude, R. H., iii. 138, 147.
 Fry, Elizabeth, ii. 105, iii. 187.
 Fryth, John, 265.
 Fuller, Andrew, ii. 104.
 Fuller, Margaret, iii. 254.
 Fundamental Constitutions, tried in the Carolinas, ii. 153 f.
- GALE, John, ii. 102.
 Galileo, 384 ff.
 Gallicanism, 470 ff., ii. 335 f., 368 ff., iii. 70 ff.
 Gambold, James, ii. 36, 39.
 Garcés, Julian, ii. 181.
 Gardiner, Allen, iii. 405.
 Gardiner, Stephen, 276, 289 f.
 Garneau, ii. 137 f.
 Garnet, 333, 421.
 Garretsson, Freeborn, ii. 277.
 Garrison, W. L., iii. 237, 242 f.
 Gaußen, L., iii. 36.
 Gellert, ii. 400 f.
 Geneva, 139 ff., 163 f., ii. 442, iii. 36.
 George I., of England, 575, ii. 30.
 George II., ii. 30.
 George III., ii. 1, 31.
 George, Duke of Saxony, 59, 69.
 Georgia, ii. 147 f., 158, 175, 204, 285.
 Gerbert, Martin, ii. 382.
 Germany, era of the Reformation, 45 ff.; of the Thirty Years' War, 436 ff.; of scholasticism and pietistic reactions,

- 579 ff.; from Wolf to Kant, ii. 389 ff.; from Kant to Schleiermacher, ii. 401 ff.; since Schleiermacher, iii. 1 ff.
- German Catholics, a schismatic party, iii. 63.
- German Evangelical Protestant Church of North America, iii. 342.
- German Evangelical Synod of North America, iii. 342.
- German Reformed Church, ii. 249, 251 ff., iii. 279 f., 342.
- German Theology, the book so named, 54.
- Gerson, John, iii. 47.
- Gibbon, Edward, ii. 19.
- Gibbons, James, iii. 313, 321.
- Giberto, 212.
- Gibson, Edmund, ii. 27.
- Gieseler, J. C. L., 592 f.
- Gill, John, ii. 103.
- Gladstone, W. E., iii. 111 f., 203.
- Glass, John, ii. 107.
- Glück, ii. 432.
- Godet, F., iii. 36.
- Godwyn, Morgan, ii. 200.
- Goerres, J. J., iii. 77.
- Goethe, ii. 427 ff.
- Gomarus, 251.
- Gonzales, 417 f.
- Goodell, William, iii. 243.
- Goodwin, John, 557.
- Gore, Charles, 162 ff.
- Gorges, Ferdinand, ii. 145, 152 f.
- Gourgues, Dominique de, ii. 136.
- Gratry, iii. 61, 96, 99.
- Greece, iii. 379 f.
- Greek, revival of the study of, 10.
- Greek Church; see Eastern Church.
- Green, J. R., 309 f., 535 f.
- Green, T. H., iii. 217, 219 f.
- Greenwood, J., 312 f.
- Grégoire, Bishop, ii. 347, 350 f., 356.
- Gregory IX., 366, 368.
- Gregory XIII., 201 f., 518, 603.
- Gregory XVI., iii. 80, 103 f., 121.
- Grellet, Stephen, iii. 308 f.
- Grey, Lady Jane, 286.
- Grimshaw, William, ii. 93.
- Grindal, Archbishop, 313.
- Grocyn, William, 14.
- Grotius, Hugo, 254.
- Grundtvig, iii. 41.
- Guenée, Antoine, ii. 318.
- Günther, A., iii. 79.
- Guericke, H., iii. 21.
- Guettée, iii. 78.
- Gueux, 'the, a league in the Netherlands, 240 f.
- Guicciardini, 12 f.
- Guise, house of, 170, 179 f., 190 ff.
- Guizot, 6, 151, 525, iii. 37.
- Gunpowder Plot, 332 f.
- Gury, J. P., 497 ff.
- Gustavus Adolphus, 444 ff.
- Gustavus Adolphus Society, iii. 9.
- Gustavus Vasa, 116 f.
- Guyon, Madame, 477 ff.
- HACKETT, H. B., iii. 294.
- Hagenbach, K. R., iii. 26, 35 f.
- Hahn, A., iii. 21.
- Hahn, P. M., ii. 399.
- Hakluyt, Richard, ii. 144.
- Haldane, Robert, iii. 36.
- Hales, John, 346, 348.
- Half-way covenant, ii. 219 f., 239.
- Hall, Gordon, iii. 390.
- Hall, Robert, 556, ii. 81, 103 f.
- Hallam, Henry, 277 f., 465.
- Halle, University of, 592.
- Haller, A., ii. 400 f.
- Haller, Berthold, 131.
- Hamann, ii. 399 f.
- Hamilton, Alexander, ii. 155.
- Hamilton, James, ii. 28.
- Hamilton, Patrick, 319 f.
- Hamilton, Sir William, iii. 215.
- Hamlin, Cyrus, iii. 396.
- Hampden, R. D., iii. 133, 166.
- Hampton Court Conference, 332.
- Hare, C. J., iii. 169.
- Harless, Adolph von, iii. 21.
- Harmonists, iii. 339.
- Harms, Claus, iii. 20.
- Harnack, Adolf, iii. 33.
- Harris, Howell, ii. 33, 61.
- Hartmann, Edward von, iii. 34.
- Harvard College, ii. 151, iii. 248.
- Hassun, iii. 381.
- Haußer, Ludwig, 41.
- Hauge, H. N., ii. 440.
- Hawéis, H. R., iii. 165 f.
- Hearne, John, ii. 27 f.
- Hedge, F. H., iii. 254, 258.
- Hefele, K. J., iii. 86, 93 f.
- Hegel, ii. 411 ff., iii. 18, 210, 219 f.
- Hegius, Alexander, 17.
- Herbert, Lord Edward, ii. 9 f.
- Heidelberg Catechism, 166.
- Helmstedt, University of, 584.
- Helvetius, ii. 311.
- Hengstenberg, E. W., iii. 20 f.

- Henry VIII., of England, 92, 259 f., 269 ff.
 Henry II., of France, 179 ff., 240.
 Henry III., 202 ff.
 Henry IV. (of Navarre), 196 f., 204 ff.
 Henry, Duke of Guise, 196 f., 204 f.
 Henry, Patrick, ii. 157.
 Henry, Robert, ii. 109.
 Herder, ii. 418.
 Hergenröther, iii. 87 f., 99, 113, 115, 120.
 Hermes, G., iii. 79.
 Herrmann, W., iii. 33.
 Herrnhut, 595.
 Hervey, James, ii. 37, 39.
 Hickes, George, ii. 3.
 Hicks, Elias, iii. 186, 308.
 Higginson, Francis, ii. 216.
 High Church, 567 ff., ii. 211, iii. 133, 139 ff., 298.
 Hill, Richard, ii. 79.
 Hill, Rowland, ii. 79.
 Hiller, P. F., ii. 399.
 Hinduism, iii. 387 f.
 Hoadley, Benjamin, 569 f.
 Hobart, Henry, iii. 298.
 Hobbes, Thomas, 539, 561, ii. 11, 389.
 Hodge, Charles, iii. 276.
 Hoffmann, G. W., iii. 8.
 Hofmann, J. C. C. von, iii. 28.
 Holland, 248 ff., 599, ii. 441 f., iii. 38 ff.
 Holy Synod, of the Russian Church, 608 f.
 Home, John, ii. 109.
 Home rule, in Ireland, iii. 201 ff.
 Hooker, Richard, 315.
 Hooker, Thomas, ii. 223 f.
 Hooper, Bishop, 283, 293.
 Hopkins, Samuel, ii. 244, 287.
 Horn, Count, 238, 243.
 Howard, John, ii. 105.
 Howe, John, 553, 556.
 Huet, F., iii. 79.
 Hug, Leonhard, ii. 382.
 Hughes, John, iii. 315 ff.
 Huguenots, their exemplary conduct in the early period of their history, 186 f.; their excuse for resorting to arms, 194; victims of massacre, 197 ff.; recovery from the onslaught, 203 ff.; safeguard in the edict of Nantes, 207 f.; political power overthrown by Richelieu, 209; suffering and expatriation under the tyranny of Louis XIV., 504 ff.; settlements in America, ii. 134 ff.
 Humanism, 7 ff.
 Hume, David, ii. 19, 56, 109 ff.
 Humphrey, Heman, iii. 244.
 Hungary, 363, 521, ii. 376, iii. 42.
 Huntingdon, Lady Selina, ii. 60 f.
 Hurst, John, 593, iii. 290, 395.
 Hutchinson, Mrs. Ann, ii. 230 f.
 Hutchinson, Thomas, ii. 217, 228.
 Hutten, Ulrich von, 21 ff.
 Hyacinthe, Père, iii. 100.
 Hymn-writers, Protestant, 106, 583, 597, ii. 61 ff., 100 ff., 104, 399 ff., iii. 17, 41.
- ICELAND**, 116.
 Iconoclasm, 193, 241 f., 322 f.
 Illescas, 222 f.
 Illuminism, ii. 395 f.
 Immaculate conception, dogma of, iii. 44 ff.
 Incas, ii. 160 ff.
 In Coena Domini, the bull, 358, ii. 370.
 Independence, asserted by the Spanish colonies, ii. 132 f.; by Brazil, ii. 134; by the English colonies, ii. 154 f.
 Independents; see Congregationalists.
 Index of prohibited books, 386 ff.; iii. 78 ff.
 Indians, treatment of, ii. 162 ff., 171, 174 ff.; missions among, 408 f., ii. 165 ff., 176 ff., iii. 404 ff.
 Indulgences, 56 ff., 128, 369, 517 ff.
 Infallibility, papal, 388 f., 487, ii. 119, iii. 13, 67 ff.; criticism of the dogma, iii. 92 ff.
 Infallibility League, iii. 76.
 Infidelity, the French, as propagated in the United States after the Revolution, iii. 225 ff.
 Ingham, Benjamin, ii. 36, 38, 42.
 Inner Mission, iii. 17.
 Innocent III., 366, 368, iii. 51.
 Innocent IV., 368.
 Innocent V., iii. 51.
 Innocent X., 451, 486.
 Innocent XI., 390, 411, 417.
 Innocent XII., 480.
 Innocent XIII., ii. 321.
 Inquisition, 365 ff.; also 184, 217 f., 223 ff., 236, 240, 245 f., 517; ii. 184 f., 380 ff.
 Institution of a Christian Man, 276.
 Interim, the Augsburg, 108 f.
 Ireland, 349 ff., 578, ii. 113 ff., iii. 201 ff.
 Ireland, John, iii. 313 f.
 Irenæus, iii. 96 f.
 Irving, Edward, iii. 194 ff.

- Irvingites, iii. 196 f.
 Italy, 210 ff., 519, ii. 379 f., iii. 123 ff.
 Ivan the Terrible, 609.
 Ives, Bishop, iii. 299.
- JACOBI, ii. 418 ff.
 Jacobites, 572, 576, ii. 2.
 Jacobs, H. E., iii. 307 f.
 Jahn, J., ii. 382.
 James I., of England, 330 ff., ii. 144.
 James II., 545 ff., ii. 152.
 James I., of Scotland, also James II.,
 James III., and James V., 318.
 Jansenists, 484 ff., ii. 324 ff.
 Jansenius, Cornelius, 486.
 Japan, 403 f., iii. 398 f.
 Jarratt, Devereux, ii. 270 f., iii. 226.
 Jefferson, Thomas, iii. 225 f.
 Jeffries, Judge, 546 f., 552.
 Jerusalem, Council of, in 1672, 606.
 Jesuits, their manœuvring in Sweden,
 118, 427 f.; their seconding of intolerant
 zeal in France, 170, 204;
 attempted propagandism, and proscription
 in England, 306 ff.; charged
 with instigating the persecution
 against Galileo and Molinos, 390 f.;
 mixed record, 391 f.; rise and organiza-
 tion of the order, 393 ff.; achieve-
 ments and reverses, 400 ff.; emphasis
 upon obedience to superior, 412 ff.;
 casuistry, 414 ff., 490 ff.; theological
 and political affinities, 425 ff.;
 conduct, 427 ff.; connection with
 James II., 548; banishment from
 Russia, 612, ii. 446 f.; labors in
 America, ii. 168, 170, 172 ff.; day of
 wrath and downfall, 328 ff.; restoration,
 379; activity in Germany after
 the Franco-Prussian war, and con-
 sequent banishment, iii. 12, 14;
 banishment from Switzerland, iii.
 35; patronage of sentimental devot-
 ion, iii. 57; banishment from Spanish
 American States, iii. 365 f.
 Jews, 380 f., iii. 343, 376.
 John III., of Sweden, 118.
 John Frederic, Elector of Saxony, 107 f.
 Johnson, Gideon, ii. 202 f.
 Johnson, Samuel, ii. 6.
 Joseph II., of Austria, ii. 367 ff.
 Joseph, Saint, special devotion to, iii.
 57 ff.
 Jowett, Benjamin, iii. 170 f.
 Juarez, Benito, iii. 358.
 Juda, Léo, 136.
 Judson, Adoniram, iii. 390 f.
- Julius II., Pope, 52, ii. 181.
 Justification, the Reformation doctrine
 of, 3 f., 53, 55, 76 f.; Wesley's
 doctrine, ii. 75; doctrine of F. D.
 Maurice, iii. 173 f.
- KAFTAN, Julius, iii. 33.
 Kahnis, K. F. A., iii. 28.
 Kaiserswerth, deaconess institute at,
 iii. 17.
 Kampschulte, 152.
 Kant, ii. 401 ff., iii. 217.
 Keble, John, iii. 188, 149.
 Keith, George, ii. 197.
 Ken, Thomas, ii. 3.
 Kendrick, A. C., iii. 294.
 Kenrick, P. R., iii. 49, 69 f., 92, 325.
 Ketteler, Bishop, iii. 11.
 Khlysti, ii. 449.
 Kierkegaard, Sören, iii. 41.
 Kilham, Alexander, iii. 179.
 Kirkham, Robert, ii. 36, 38.
 Killen, W. D., ii. 119, 122, iii. 203 f.
 King, William, ii. 118, 123.
 Kingsbury, Cyrus, iii. 405.
 King's Chapel, ii. 206.
 King's College, ii. 205.
 Kingsley, Charles, iii. 173.
 Klieforth, T. F. D., iii. 28.
 Klopstock, Friedrich, ii. 400 f.
 Knapp, Albert, iii. 17.
 Know-Nothing party, iii. 313.
 Knox, John, relation of his work to
 the rise of the Scotch commonality,
 318; his first labors as a reformer,
 320 f.; his character, 321 f.; part in
 the overturning of Romanism in
 Scotland, 322 f.; relations with the
 Queen of Scots, 324 ff.; preference
 for the Presbyterian polity, 328;
 share in the preparation of the
 Scotch Confession and the Book of
 Common Order, 330.
 Krapf, J. L., iii. 399.
 Krauth, C. P., iii. 307.
 Krüdener, Madam von, iii. 36.
 Kuennen, iii. 39.
 Kulturkampf, iii. 10 ff.
 Kuyper, iii. 40.
- LABADIE, Jean de, 600.
 Labadists, 600.
 La Bruyère, 466.
 Lacordaire, iii. 75.
 Lacroix, 497 f.
 Lafayette, ii. 356, 360.

- La Fontaine, 465.
 Lambeth Conference, its plan of union, iii. 301.
 Lambruschini, Cardinal, iii. 58.
 Lamennais, iii. 75, 77.
 Lamettrie, ii. 311.
 Lampe, F. A., ii. 442.
 Lange, Joachim, iii. 394.
 Lardner, N., ii. 20, 99.
 La Rochefoucauld, 466 f.
 La Salle, ii. 136, 173.
 La Saussaye, Chantepie de, iii. 39 f.
 Las Casas, ii. 162.
 Lassalle, iii. 5.
 Lateran Council, the Fourth, 366, 371; the Fifth, 430.
 Latimer, Hugh, 265 f., 279, 293 ff.
 Laud, Archbishop, 337 ff.
 Laval, François de, ii. 186 f.
 Lavalette, Antoine, ii. 330.
 Lavater, J. G., ii. 400.
 Law, William, ii. 3 ff., 20, 25 f.
 Law of Papal Guarantees, iii. 125 f.
 Laymann, 418 ff.
 Laynez, James, 395.
 Lay preachers, 590, ii. 66 f.
 Lazarists, iii. 14.
 League, the Roman Catholic in France, 203 ff.; in Germany, 440.
 Lecky, W. E. H., ii. 27, 95.
 Leclerc, 175.
 Le Clerc, Jean, ii. 442.
 Lee, Jesse, ii. 277 f.
 Lee, R. H., ii. 157.
 Lefèvre, Jacques, 14, 171 ff.
 Leibnitz, 588, ii. 389 ff.
 Leighton, Robert, 562.
 Leipzig disputation, 69 ff.
 Leland, John, ii. 20, 23 f.
 Leo I., Pope, iii. 97 f.
 Leo X., 20, 56, 63 f., 77 f., 355, 603.
 Leo XII., iii. 103.
 Leo XIII., his relation to the settlement of the *Kulturkampf*, iii. 16 f.; patronage of the worship of the Virgin and the saints, 54, 57 f.; commendation of the Scholastic method, 74; approval of the Syllabus, 113 f.; exposition of papal prerogatives, 120 f.; statements relative to religious freedom, 121 f.; insistence upon the Pope's right to the Estates of the Church, 127; encyclical on property and labor, 129; letter to the French bishops relative to schools, 319.
 Leopold I., Emperor, 520 f.
- Leopold II., ii. 376.
 Lequeux, iii. 78.
 Leslie, Charles, ii. 3.
 Le Tellier, 515.
 Lewes, G. H., ii. 427 f.
 L'Hospital, Michael de, 189.
 Liberatore, iii. 117 ff., 127.
 Libertines, the, at Geneva, 156.
 Lichtenberger, F., iii. 19.
 Limborch, Philip van, ii. 442.
 Lincoln, Abraham, iii. 243 f.
 Lindsey, Theophilus, iii. 249.
 Liguori, 497 ff., ii. 382, iii. 81, 95.
 Linacre, Thomas, 14.
 Littledale, R. F., iii. 152 f.
 Livingstone, David, iii. 399 f.
 Livingstone, J. H., ii. 251.
 Llorente, 223, 381, 517, ii. 381.
 Locke, John, 549, 561, 566 f., ii. 4, 12, 153, 389, iii. 132.
 Lollards, 264.
 Lolland Statute, 281, 288, 292.
 Löschner, Ernst, ii. 394.
 London Company, ii. 144, 149.
 Louis XIII., of France, 209.
 Louis XIV., 390, 459 ff., 505 ff., 563, ii. 291, 319.
 Louis XV., ii. 291.
 Louis XVI., ii. 291.
 Louis, Prince of Condé, 181, 190, 194.
 Louis of Nassau, 241.
 Louisiana, ii. 142.
 Losee, William, iii. 347.
 Lotze, Hermann, iii. 28, 34 f.
 Lourdes, alleged appearance of the Virgin at, iii. 51 f., 56.
 Low Church, 567 ff., ii. 211, iii. 297 f.
 Loyola, Ignatius, 393 ff.
 Lucius III., 366.
 Lundy, Benjamin, iii. 244.
 Luthardt, C. E., iii. 28.
 Luther, Martin, his confessed obligation to Reuchlin, 20 f.; reputation for good moral character, as mentioned by Erasmus, 31; birth and early education, 45 ff.; choice of monastic life and experience in the cloister, 47 ff.; call to a professorship at Wittenberg, 50 f.; talent as a preacher, 51 f.; visit to Rome, 52 f.; visitation of the cloisters of his order, 53 f.; continued progress in evangelical thinking, 54 f.; resentment against the malpractice with indulgences, and resulting theses, 56 ff.; effect of the theses, and attempted replies, 61 ff.; summons to

- appear before the papal legate Cajetan, in 1518, at Augsburg, 65 ff.; agreement to a truce, 67 f.; disputation with Eck at Leipzig, 69 ff.; revised view respecting Huss, and denial of the infallibility of a general council, 71 f.; notable writings issued in 1520, 72 ff.; condemnation of his teaching by the Pope, 77 f.; the defiant answer, 78 f.; summons to, and appearance before, the Diet of Worms, in 1521, 79 ff.; subjection to the imperial ban, 82 f.; stay in the Wartburg castle, 84 f.; translation of the Bible, 86 f.; contest with Anabaptist enthusiasts, 87 f.; attitude toward the peasant revolt, 91; bitter reply to the attack of Henry VIII., 92; the *De Servo Arbitrio*, in response to a book by Erasmus, 93; marriage and domestic life, 93 f.; conviction that the people were not then qualified for a democratic type of church government, 95; preparation of catechisms, 95; aversion to warlike leagues in behalf of religion, 97; conclusion that Zwingli's view of the eucharist was a bar to fellowship, 97; advice in connection with the proposed plural marriage of Philip of Hesse, 103 ff.; death, 105; character, 105 f.; contrast with Zwingli, 123 ff.
- Lutherans, in Europe, 97 ff., 113 ff., 165, 450, 579 ff., ii. 388 ff., iii. 6 ff., 38, 40 ff.; in America, ii. 278 ff., iii. 302 ff., 342 f., 356.
- MACAULAY, 335 f., 532, ii. 98.
- McClintock, John, iii. 290.
- McCrie, Thomas, 211, 216, 218, 221, 490.
- M'Gill, Dr., ii. 112.
- McHale, Archbishop, iii. 203.
- Mellvain, C. P., iii. 298.
- Mackay, W. S., 405 f.
- Mackenzie, Edward, iii. 403.
- Maclay, R. S., iii. 399 f.
- Madagascar, iii. 408.
- Madison, James, ii. 155.
- Madison, James (Bishop), ii. 212.
- Mahan, of Oberlin, iii. 264.
- Maine, ii. 151.
- Malan, Cæsar, iii. 36.
- Malebranche, 504, ii. 390.
- Mallinkrodt, iii. 12.
- Malou, Bishop of Bruges, iii. 53 f., 64.
- Mandeville, Bernard de, ii. 19.
- Manning, Cardinal, iii. 62, 71, 89, 92, 115, 147, 159.
- Mansel, H. L., iii. 174.
- Mant, Richard, ii. 121.
- Maret, H. L. C., iii. 93, 96.
- Margaret, sister of Francis I., 172 f.
- Margaret of Parma, 237, 242.
- Mariana, 427.
- Mariano, iii. 128.
- Maria Theresa, ii. 367 ff., 374 f.
- Marriage, disputed jurisdiction over, iii. 15, 105 ff., 110, 127, 361, 367 f.
- Marrow Men, ii. 112.
- Marshman, J., iii. 389.
- Martensen, H. L., iii. 41.
- Martin, Henri, 174, 193, 461, 483, 516, ii. 336 f.
- Martineau, James, iii. 186, 214.
- Martyr, Peter, 217, 282.
- Martyrdoms, effect of, in France, 186; in England, 300.
- Mary, Queen of England, Roman Catholic reaction under, 286 ff.
- Mary, wife of James V. of Scotland, 180, 323.
- Mary (Stuart), Queen of Scots, 180 f., 306, 308 f., 323 ff.
- Mary, the Virgin, dogma of her immaculate conception, iii. 44 ff.; promotion of her worship, iii. 52 ff.
- Marx, Karl, iii. 6.
- Maryland, ii. 146, 153, 175, 189 ff., 196 f., 203 f., 207.
- Mason, George, ii. 157.
- Mason, John, ii. 145.
- Massachusetts Bay, Colony of, ii. 145, 150 ff., 175, 188, 221, 225 ff.
- Massillon, 469 f.
- Matamoros, iii. 42.
- Mather, Alexander, ii. 70.
- Mather, Cotton, ii. 213, 218, 233.
- Mathew, Theobald, iii. 204 f.
- Matthias, Emperor, and King of Bohemia, 440.
- Maurice, Duke of Saxony, 107 ff.
- Maurice, son of William of Orange, and Stadholder of Holland, 249, 258 f., 257.
- Maurice, F. D., ii. 4, iii. 172 ff.
- Maxfield, Thomas, ii. 67, 77.
- Maximilian I., Emperor, 35 ff., 42.
- Maximilian, of Bavaria, 442.
- Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, and proclaimed Emperor of Mexico, iii. 359 ff.
- Mayhew, Thomas, ii. 177.
- Mazarin, 504 f.

- Meade, William, iii. 298.
 Mediation School, iii. 25 ff.
 Medici family, 11.
 Melanchthon, Philip, pupil and relative of Reuchlin, 21; his part in preparing the Augsburg Confession, 98; important contributions from him to the Reformation, 110 ff.; doctrinal points upon which he came to differ from Luther, 113; referred to, 146, 162.
 Melville, Andrew, 329 f.
 Mendelssohn, F. B., ii. 432.
 Mendelssohn, Moses, ii. 395.
 Mendoza, ii. 132.
 Menendez, ii. 130, 135.
 Mennonites, 600, ii. 268, iii. 342 f.
 Mercersberg theology, iii. 280.
 Meteron, 245.
 Methodist Episcopal Church, ii. 272 ff., iii. 238 ff., 280 ff., 341.
 Methodist Episcopal Church South, iii. 242, 255 ff., 341.
 Methodist Free Church, iii. 179.
 Methodist New Connection, iii. 179.
 Methodist Protestant Church, iii. 284.
 Methodists, their beginnings in England, ii. 34 ff.; Whitefield and Calvinistic Methodism, ii. 53 ff.; Charles Wesley and Methodist hymnology, ii. 62 ff.; John Wesley and organized Methodism, ii. 64 ff.; results of the Methodist revival, ii. 92 ff.; later developments in England, iii. 179 ff.; Methodists in Ireland, ii. 124 f.; in America, ii. 268 ff., iii. 280 ff., 341, 343, 346, 356, 364, 372; in the mission-field, iii. 393, 397, 399, 402 f., 405 ff.
 Metternich, iii. 2.
 Mexico, ii. 128, 165 ff., 183, iii. 356 ff.
 Mezeray, 178 f.
 Michaud, P. E., iii. 78, 100.
 Mikado, the, iii. 398.
 Miley, John, iii. 290.
 Mill, James, iii. 211 f.
 Mill, J. S., ii. 21, iii. 211 ff.
 Mill, Walter, 322.
 Millerism, iii. 229.
 Milman, H. H., 233, iii. 175.
 Milne, William, iii. 397.
 Milner, Isaac, ii. 94.
 Milner, Joseph, ii. 94.
 Milnor, James, iii. 298.
 Miltitz, 68.
 Milton, John, 346, 555.
 Mirabeau, ii. 342, 345 f.
- Miracles, reputed, 429, ii. 324 ff., iii. 51 f., 56.
 Missions, Roman Catholic, 402 ff., ii. 165 ff., 170 ff.; Protestant, in the West Indies, iii. 384 f., 406; in Greenland and Labrador, iii. 385; in India and Burma, iii. 386 ff.; in Java, Sumatra, and Turkey, iii. 395 f.; in China, iii. 396 ff.; in Japan, iii. 398 f.; in Africa, iii. 385 f., 399 ff.; among the American Indians, ii. 176 ff., iii. 404 ff.; in the Society, Friendly, Fiji, Sandwich, and other Islands, iii. 406 ff.
 Moderates, in the Scottish Church, ii. 107 ff., iii. 190.
 Möhler, J. A., 3, iii. 72.
 Moffatt, Robert, iii. 401.
 Mohammedanism, iii. 395 f., 404.
 Molanus, 588.
 Molière, 464.
 Molina, Louis, 426, 486.
 Molinos, 389 ff., 477.
 Mollio, John, 214, 219 f.
 Molokani, ii. 448 f.
 Molther, Philip, ii. 65.
 Monasteries, dissolution of the English, 277 f.; secularization of the French, ii. 340; suppression of many, in Austria by Joseph II., ii. 370; other instances of suppression, iii. 365, 380.
 Monasticism, Russian, 609 f., ii. 447.
 Moncrief, William, ii. 105 f.
 Monita Secreta, 411.
 Monk, General, 535.
 Monod, A., iii. 37.
 Monod, F., iii. 37.
 Montalembert, iii. 75 f., 80, 87.
 Montenegro, iii. 381.
 Montesquieu, ii. 294 f., 303 ff.
 Moody, D. L., iii. 229.
 Moore, Channing, iii. 298.
 Moore, Hannah, ii. 94.
 Moravians, 593 ff., ii. 42, 44 ff., 64 f., 180, iii. 342, 383 ff.
 More, Henry, 560.
 More, Thomas, 15 f., 268, 274 f.
 Morgan, Thomas, ii. 17 f.
 Morgan, William, ii. 36, 38.
 Mormon, Book of, iii. 331 f.
 Mormons, iii. 331 ff., 342.
 Mornay, Duplessis, 207.
 Morone, Cardinal, 212.
 Morrison, Robert, iii. 397.
 Motley, J. L., 242 f.
 Mozart, ii. 432.

- Müller, Julins, iii. 18.
 Münster, Anabaptist rule at, 101 f.
 Münter, Thomas, 88, 91.
 Muggletonians, 526.
 Muhlenberg, H. M., ii. 279.
 Muhlenberg, W. A., iii. 299.
 Muratori, ii. 382, iii. 50.
 Murdoch, James, iii. 349.
 Murray, Archbishop, iii. 70.
 Murray, Earl of, 325 f.
 Murray, John, ii. 280.
 Muurling, iii. 39.
 Myconius, Oswald, 136.
 Myers, Frederic, iii. 168 f.
 Mysticism, 580 ff., 600 f., ii. 5 f., 184 f.
- NANTES, Edict of, 207 f.; revocation of the edict, 509; approval of the revocation by Archbishop Maury, ii. 347.
 Napoleon I., ii. 300 f., 347, 355 ff.
 Napoleon III., iii. 5, 108 f., 124, 358.
 Nast, William, iii. 290.
 Neal, Daniel, ii. 96.
 Neander, J. A. W., iii. 18 ff.
 Nelson, John, ii. 67.
 Nelson, Robert, ii. 3.
 Neo-Kantian School, iii. 28 ff.
 Neo-Lutheran School, iii. 27 f.
 Nesbit, Robert, iii. 392.
 Nestorians, iii. 381.
 Netherlands, 234 ff., 599 f., ii. 440 ff., iii. 38 ff.
 Nevin, J. W., iii. 280.
 Newell, Samuel, iii. 390.
 New Hampshire, ii. 150 f., 205.
 New Haven Colony, ii. 146, 150 f., 221 f.
 New Haven theology, iii. 262 f.
 New Jersey, ii. 147, 153, 204.
 Newman, J. H., iii. 70 f., 112, 116 f., 138 f., 143 f., 159 ff., 329 f.
 New Mexico, ii. 130, 167 f.
 New Netherland, ii. 146.
 Newton, Sir Isaac, 562.
 Newton, John, ii. 94.
 Newton, Robert, iii. 181.
 New West Education Commission, iii. 270.
 New York, ii. 146, 188.
 Nicholas I., of Russia, iii. 374.
 Nicolai, C. F., ii. 395.
 Nicole, 466 f.
 Nicon, 611.
 Nihilists, iii. 375.
 Nitschmann, David, ii. 42, iii. 384.
 Nitzsch, K. J., iii. 18.
- Nobles, the German, in the early part of the sixteenth century, 39; overthrow of the French in the Revolution, ii. 298 f.
 Nonconformists; see Dissenters.
 Nonjurors, the English, ii. 1 ff., iii. 140.
 Non-resistance, doctrine of, 538 f., 549.
 North-German Confederacy, iii. 4.
 Northumberland, Duke of, 281, 286.
 Norton, Andrews, iii. 249.
 Norway, 115 f., ii. 440, iii. 41.
 Nott, Henry, iii. 390.
 Novalis, ii. 431.
 Nova Scotia, ii. 136, 141 f.
 Noyes, J. H., iii. 340.
 Nürnberg, Diet of, in 1522, 430 f.
 Nuñez, Vasco, ii. 128.
 Nuremberg, Peace of, 101.
- OBERLIN College, iii. 264.
 Occasional Conformity Bill, 574 f.
 Ochino, 217.
 O'Connell, Daniel, iii. 201 f.
 Odet, of the house of Châtillon, 182.
 Oecolampadius, 21, 97, 131 f., 136.
 Oettinger, ii. 399 f.
 Oglethorpe, ii. 42, 147 f.
 O'Keefe, Bishop, ii. 119.
 Old Catholics, iii. 11, 13, 99 ff.
 Olin, Stephen, iii. 289.
 Olivers, Thomas, ii. 81.
 Olivétan, 172.
 Oneida Perfectionists, iii. 340.
 Oratory of Divine Love, 211 f.
 Ordinations, John Wesley's, ii. 69 ff.
 Organic Articles, ii. 359 f.
 Oriel School, iii. 133.
 Orleans, Duke of, Regent of France, ii. 291, 336.
 Otterbein, William, ii. 252.
 Ouseley, Gideon, ii. 125.
 Overton, J. H., ii. 8, 14.
 Owen, John, 555 f.
 Owen, Robert, iii. 339 f.
 Owen, Robert Dale, iii. 340.
 Oxford, beginnings of the Reformation at, 265 f.; largely possessed by Puritanism, 310; rights invaded by James II., 552; seat of Methodism in its primary stage, ii. 36 ff.; admission of Dissenters, iii. 134 f.; rise of tractarianism, iii. 136 ff.
- PAINES, Thomas, ii. 19, 95, iii. 225.
 Paleario, 214 f., 221.
 Pallavicino, 2, 361.

- Palmer, William, iii. 137 f.
 Papacy, the, virtually solicits to, and ostentatiously rejoices over, the St. Bartholomew massacre, 201 f.; persists for a time after the outbreak of the Reformation in an absorbing attention to political advantage, but at length gives heed to the demands of spiritual supremacy, 355 ff.; escapes definite limitations upon its absolutist claims at the council of Trent, 361 f.; exposes its fallibility on questions of morals in the bull *Unigenitus*, 502 f.; successful as regards territorial possessions, but weak in respect of general influence, 519; gives away America, ii. 126 f.; harries France with the bull *Unigenitus*, ii. 292 f., 301 f., 318 ff.; submits to reverses in the era of the French Revolution, ii. 348; patronizes worship of the Virgin and the saints, iii. 44 ff.; is intemperately exalted by the advocates of infallibility, iii. 59 ff.; asserts absolute authority for itself, iii. 64 ff.; suppresses opposition to the dogma of infallibility, and secures its proclamation, iii. 67 ff.; champions mediæval ideas in the *Syllabus*, iii. 109 ff.; refuses to be reconciled to the loss of its temporal power, iii. 126 f.; blesses Maximilian's enterprise in Mexico, and exhorts him to pursue a reactionary policy, iii. 359 f.
 Paraguay, 407 f., ii. 129, 168, iii. 369.
 Paramo, 222, 382.
 Pareau, iii. 39.
 Parker, Matthew, 313.
 Parker, Theodore, iii. 254.
 Parkman, Francis, ii. 141 f., 187.
 Parliament, the Long, 343 f., 525.
 Parliament of Paris, ii. 293 f.
 Parsis, iii. 388.
 Parton, James, ii. 309.
 Pascal, 411, 489 ff.
 Pascali, 221.
 Pascalis Martinez, ii. 354 f.
 Passau, Treaty of, 109.
 Patriarchate, in Russia, 608.
 Patronage, in the English Church, ii. 1; in the Scottish Church, ii. 105 ff., iii. 190 f.
 Patteson, J. C., iii. 408.
 Paul III., 212, 356.
 Paul IV., 227, 300, 303, 356 f., 372 f., iii. 115.
 Paul V., 358 f., 387.
 Paulus, E. G., ii. 414.
 Pauvau, 175.
 Pearce, Zachary, ii. 20, 22.
 Pearson, John, 558.
 Peasantry, the German, 39 ff., 90 f.
 Pegna, 369 ff., 375.
 Penance, its relation to Roman Catholic casuistry, 415 f.
 Penn, William, ii. 147, 153, 266 f.
 Pennsylvania, ii. 147, 153, 175, 187 f.
 Percival, A., iii. 138.
 Perez, Juan, 222.
 Perfection, Christian, as taught by Wesley, ii. 76 ff.
 Perrault, 490.
 Persons, Robert, 307.
 Peru and the Peruvians, ii. 128 f., 160, 164, iii. 367.
 Pestalozzi, 166.
 Petavius (or Petau), 504.
 Peter, the Great, 608, 612.
 Peterson, Lawrence and Olaf, 116 f.
 Petrarch, 11.
 Petre, Jesuit at the court of James II., 548.
 Pfleiderer, Otto, iii. 26 f., 33 f., 215, 217 f.
 Philaret, 604, 606, 608 f., ii. 447.
 Philip of Hesse, 102 ff., 107 ff.
 Philip II., of Spain, 163, 184, 200 f., 227, 231 ff., 237, 240, 287, 307, ii. 135.
 Philip V., 517.
 Philip, Indian chief, ii. 176.
 Pico, John, 11, 18; John Francis, 13.
 Piedmont, iii. 124.
 Pietism, 588 ff., ii. 387.
 Pilgrims, ii. 145.
 Pilmoor, Joseph, ii. 269.
 Pistoja, Synod of, ii. 373.
 Pius IV., 357.
 Pius V., 201, 306 f., 357 f., 372, 434.
 Pius VI., ii. 348, 379.
 Pius VII., ii. 359, 361 f., 379.
 Pius VIII., iii. 105.
 Pius IX., his relation to Germany in the *Kultukampf*, iii. 15 f.; proclamation of the dogma of the Virgin's immaculate conception, iii. 45 ff.; patronage of sentimental devotion, 52 ff.; efforts in behalf of the declaration of papal infallibility, 78 ff.; support of political absolutism, 104; attempt through the *Syllabus* to sustain a reactionary scheme, 109 ff.; refusal to recognize the unification

- of Italy, 59 f., 126; provision for Ultramontane propaganda in Ireland, 202; instructions to Maximilian in Mexico, 359 f.
- Pizarro, Francisco, ii. 128 f.
- Placaeus, 601.
- Plan of Union, between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, iii. 261 f., 271, 274.
- Plenary Council of Baltimore, the First, iii. 315; the Second, iii. 316; the Third, iii. 316, 319 f.
- Plutschau, H., iii. 386.
- Plymouth Brethren, iii. 189.
- Plymouth Colony, ii. 145, 150 f., 174 f.
- Poiret, Pierre, 601.
- Poland, 363 f., 521 f., 604, ii. 366, iii. 378 f.
- Pole, Cardinal, 212, 237 ff., 300 f.
- Polity; see Church Constitution.
- Polygamy, Mormon, iii. 334 ff.
- Pombal, ii. 329 f.
- Pope, Alexander, ii. 28, iii. 132.
- Pope, W. B., iii. 181.
- Popes; see Papacy.
- Popham, George, ii. 144 f.
- Porter, Ebenezer, iii. 244.
- Port Royal, 488 f., 502.
- Portugal, 367, 383, ii. 381.
- Praise of Folly, a book by Erasmus, 27 f.
- Presbyterians, in England, 311 f., 344 f., 529, 540 ff., ii. 96 ff., iii. 185; in Scotland, 328 ff., 530, ii. 105 ff., iii. 190 ff.; in Ireland, 352, 531, 544, ii. 121 ff., iii. 203, 206 f.; in America, ii. 249 ff., 287, iii. 237 f., 270 ff., 341, 349 f., 356, 364, 372.
- Prescott, W. H., 233, 236, 239.
- Price, Richard, ii. 99.
- Prierias, Sylvester, 62.
- Priestley, Joseph, ii. 99 f., iii. 186.
- Prime, N. S., iii. 244.
- Primitive Methodists, iii. 179.
- Probabilism, 416 ff., 476, 495 f., iii. 99.
- Progressive Orthodoxy, iii. 268 ff.
- Proprietary governments, ii. 152 f.
- Protestant Episcopal Church; see Episcopal Church.
- Protestantism, its first organized Churches, 94 ff.; first use of the name, 96 f.; slight influence in the Greek Church, 605 ff.; see also details under the different countries.
- Protestant Society, in Germany, iii. 9.
- Proudhon, iii. 131.
- Provincial Letters, 411, 489 ff.
- Provost, Samuel, ii. 205, 210.
- Prussia, 95 f., 513, ii. 383 ff., iii. 1 ff.
- Public Schools, the controversy respecting, iii. 315 ff.; see under Education.
- Pueblo Indians, ii. 130, 167 f.
- Purcell, J. B., iii. 325.
- Puritanism, first tokens of, 261, 283; development and fortunes in the reign of Elizabeth, 310 ff.; advance and struggle in the time of James I. and Charles I., 335 ff.; proscription under the restored Stuarts, 537 ff.; settlements and church establishments in America, ii. 145, 213 ff.
- Pusey, E. B., iii. 139, 142, 148 f., 155.
- QUAKERS, 529 f., ii. 104 f., 157, 198, 233 ff., 265 ff., 286 f., iii. 186 f., 308 f., 342 f.
- Quebec Act, ii. 143.
- Quemadero, 381.
- Quesnel, 502.
- RACINE, 465.
- Raemond, Florimond de, 51, 152, 187.
- Raleigh, Sir Walter, ii. 144.
- Rambaud, 610 f., ii. 445, iii. 374.
- Ranke, Leopold von, 36, 280, ii. 377 f.
- Rankin, Thomas, ii. 270.
- Ranters, 526.
- Rapp, George, iii. 339.
- Raskolnikov, 611 f., ii. 444, 447 f., iii. 377 f.
- Rationalism, German, ii. 387 f., 395 ff., 413 ff.
- Ravenscroft, Thomas, iii. 298.
- Raymond, Miner, iii. 290.
- Reaction, the Roman Catholic, 362 ff., 401.
- Reason, deification of, in the crisis of the French Revolution, ii. 351 f.
- Rebmann, John, iii. 399.
- Recollects, ii. 172.
- Redemptorists, 497, iii. 14.
- Reformation, the, relation of the enlarged horizon at the beginning of the sixteenth century to its initiation, 1 f.; its distinctive features, 2 ff.; its chronological terminus, 5 f.; its simultaneous initiation in different countries, 122; the special cast which it assumed in England, 258 ff.; points of view which enter into its justification, 452 ff.; see also under the different countries.
- Reformed, the, as distinguished from the Lutherans, 97, 165, 450.

- Reformed Episcopal Church, iii. 301.
 Régale, dispute over the, 472.
 Regium Donum, ii. 123 f.
 Reid, Thomas, ii. 109, 111.
 Reign of Terror, ii. 299 f., 346, 351 f.
 Reimarus, ii. 395.
 Reinbeck, J. G., ii. 394.
 Reinhard, F. V., ii. 413 f.
 Reinkens, Bishop, iii. 99.
 Relief Synod, ii. 106.
 Remonstrants, in Holland, 252 ff., ii. 442; in Ireland, iii. 207.
 Renaissance, the Italian, 10 ff.
 Renan, iii. 22, 37.
 Renée, Princess, 213.
 Resquescens, 247.
 Reservatum ecclesiasticum, 110, 437.
 Restitution, Edict of, 443 f.
 Restorationists, Association of Universal, iii. 259.
 Reuchlin, John, 17 ff.
 Revision of the 'King James version, iii. 135.
 Revivals, the Methodist in England, ii. 33 ff.; that begun by Jonathan Edwards and continued by Whitefield in New England, ii. 33, 240 ff.; those occurring in the United States since the colonial era, iii. 227 ff.
 Revolution, the American, ii. 154 f.; the English of 1688, 553 f., 563, 571 f., 576; the French, ii. 290 ff., 298 ff., 338 f.
 Rhode Island, ii. 146, 150, 152, 156, 188.
 Ribaut, ii. 135.
 Richelieu, 209, 488.
 Ridley, Nicholas, 283, 293, 296 f.
 Rienzi, Cola di, 11.
 Rigg, James, ii. 92, iii. 181.
 Ripley, George, iii. 254.
 Ritschl, Albrecht, iii. 28 ff.
 Ritualism, in England, iii. 136 ff.; in America, iii. 298 f.
 River Brethren, iii. 343.
 Rizzio, 326.
 Robert College, iii. 396.
 Robertson, F. W., iii. 175.
 Robertson, William, ii. 107, 109.
 Robespierre, ii. 352.
 Robinson, John, 312, ii. 215 f.
 Robinson, Robert, ii. 102.
 Rogers, John, 293, 296 f.
 Rolands, Daniel, ii. 33, 61.
 Rolfe, John, ii. 174.
 Romaine, William, ii. 60.
 Roman Catholics, treatment of, by Elizabeth, 305 ff.; laws against, in Scotland, 323; penal enactments against, in England under James I. and succeeding Kings, 332 ff., 565 f.; leading events among them in the Reformation era, 355 ff.; legal proscription in Ireland, ii. 113 ff.; condition in Ireland since 1800, iii. 201 ff.; release from disabilities, ii. 96, 118, iii. 134; reorganization of the hierarchy in England, iii. 189 f.; course of their history in Spanish and French America in the colonial era, ii. 181 ff.; in the English colonies, ii. 187 ff.; in the United States since the colonial era, iii. 309 ff.; in Canada, ii. 142 f., iii. 351 ff.; in Spanish America since the colonial era, iii. 356 ff.; see also under various countries.
 Romantic School, ii. 431 f.
 Rosicrucians, 526.
 Rothe, Richard, iii. 26 f.
 Rottmann, Bernhard, 101 f.
 Rousseau, J. J., ii. 295 ff., 312 ff.
 Roussel, 173.
 Rudolph, Emperor, and King of Bohemia, 440.
 Rumania, iii. 381.
 Rush, Benjamin, ii. 286.
 Russia, 603 ff., ii. 443 ff., iii. 374.
 Ryerson, Egerton, iii. 348.
 Ryland, John, ii. 104.
 SACRED Heart, institution of devotion to the, ii. 327 f.
 Sadoletto, 212.
 Sailer, Michael, ii. 382.
 St. Bartholomew Massacre, 196 ff.
 Saint Cyran, 486, 488.
 Sainte Aldegonde, 241.
 St. Germain, Edict of, 192.
 Saint-Martin, ii. 354 f.
 Saint Simon, iii. 130.
 Salmeron, Alphonse, 395.
 Salvation Army, iii. 136.
 Salzburgers, 522, ii. 279.
 Sandeman, Robert, ii. 107.
 Sanders, Lawrence, 293.
 San Roman, 226.
 Satolli, Mgr., iii. 323.
 Saybrook Platform, ii. 220.
 Scepticism, antecedent to the French Revolution, ii. 301 ff.; see also Rationalism and Infidelity.
 Schade, J. K., 591.

- Schaff, Philip, 166 f., iii. 280.
 Schelling, ii. 409 f.
 Schérer, iii. 37.
 Schiller, ii. 430 f.
 Schism Act, 575.
 Schlatter, Michael, ii. 252.
 Schlegel, A. W., ii. 431; Frederic, ii. 431 f.
 Schmolck, Benjamin, ii. 400.
 Schmucker, S. S., iii. 303 f.
 Scholasticism, the Lutheran, 579 f.
 Scholten, iii. 39.
 Schopenhauer, Arthur, iii. 34.
 Schrader, iii. 111.
 Schuch, Wolfgang, 175.
 Schürmann, Anna Maria von, 600.
 Schultens, A., ii. 442.
 Schultz, B., iii. 386.
 Schwartz, C. F., iii. 386 f.
 Schwarz, Karl, iii. 27.
 Schwenfeldians, iii. 343.
 Scotland, 317 ff., 524, 530 f., 576 ff., ii. 105 ff., iii. 190 ff.
 Scott Orange, iii. 241.
 Scott, Thomas, ii. 94.
 Scott, Walter, ii. 31, iii. 199.
 Scriptures, to be read by all classes, according to Erasmus, 28 f.; translated by Luther, 86 f.; rendered into French, 172; Italian versions, 210; Spanish versions, 222; English translation, 266 ff.; its circulation by law, 278; general distribution condemned by papal and other manifesto, 267, 389, ii. 379, iii. 80, 204, 417 f.
 Scrivener, Christian, 581, 583.
 Seabury, Samuel, ii. 210 f.
 Secker, Archbishop, ii. 29.
 Selden, John, 344 f.
 Sellon, Walter, ii. 81.
 Selyns, ii. 250.
 Semler, J. S., ii. 397 f.
 Serfdom, abolished in Russia, iii. 374 f.
 Sergeant, John, ii. 179.
 Servetus, Michael, 157 ff.
 Servia, iii. 381.
 Seventh-Day Baptists, ii. 264.
 Shaftesbury, ii. 13 f.
 Shakers, iii. 339.
 Shakespeare, 317, 464.
 Sheldon, Bishop, 540.
 Shelley, iii. 132.
 Sherlock, Thomas, ii. 20.
 Sherlock, William, ii. 3, 97.
 Shintoism, iii. 398 f.
 Sickengen, Franz von, 39.
 Sidney, Sir Henry, 351.
- Sigismund, King of Poland, 118, 604.
 Simeon, Charles, ii. 94.
 Simon, Richard, 474, 481 f.
 Simpson, Matthew, iii. 289 f.
 Simpson, Glasgow professor, ii. 112, 124.
 Six Articles, the, 278.
 Sixtus IV, iii. 51.
 Sixtus V, 410.
 Skoptsi, ii. 449.
 Slavery, ii. 90, 105, 155 ff., 163, 170, 176, 286 ff., iii. 233 ff., 242 ff., 369.
 Smalcald League, 101, 108.
 Smith, H. B., iii. 275 f.
 Smith, H. P., iii. 279.
 Smith, Joseph, iii. 331 ff.
 Smith, Sidney, iii. 389.
 Smith, W. R., iii. 201.
 Smylie, James, iii. 235.
 Smyth, E. C., iii. 270.
 Social Brethren, iii. 343.
 Socialism, iii. 5 f., 130 f., 339 f.
 Society for Ethical Culture, iii. 343.
 Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Indians, ii. 178.
 Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, ii. 196.
 Socinians, 363, 522, 527.
 Solemn League and Covenant, 342 ff., 543.
 Soliman II., 100.
 Somaj, theistic society, iii. 394 f.
 Somerset, Duke of, 281.
 Sorbonne, 14, 169, 471.
 South, Robert, 558 f., ii. 97.
 South America, ii. 128 f., 168 ff., 182 ff., iii. 366 ff.
 South Carolina, ii. 207.
 Spain, 322 ff., 367, 380 ff., ii. 380 f., iii. 42 f., 109.
 Spalatin, 80 f.
 Spalding, J. L., iii. 321.
 Spalding, M. J., iii. 325.
 Spangenberg, 597.
 Spanish Succession, War of the, 516.
 Spencer, Herbert, iii. 215 ff.
 Spener, P. J., 588 ff.
 Spenser, Edmund, 317, 351 ff.
 Spinoza, Benedict, 383, ii. 390.
 Spires, Diet of, 96.
 Spiritism, iii. 340 f.
 Spitta, C. J. P., iii. 17.
 Spurgeon, C. H., iii. 182 f.
 Stanley, A. P., iii. 135, 166, 169 f., 175.
 Stanley, H. M., iii. 400.
 Starovers, 612.
 States-General, assembled on the eve of the French Revolution, ii. 298 f.

- Statistics, denominational, iii. 230, 341 ff., 356.
 Stattler, Benedict, ii. 382.
 Staupitz, 48 f.
 Stearns, Shubal, ii. 262.
 Steele, Daniel, iii. 290.
 Stennett, Samuel, ii. 104.
 Stevens, Abel, ii. 60, 73, iii. 290.
 Stevens, A. H., iii. 235.
 Stewart, Dugald, ii. 111.
 Stewart, John, iii. 405.
 Stilling, J. H., ii. 400.
 Stillingfleet, Edward, 558, ii. 71.
 Stoddard, Solomon, ii. 220.
 Storr, G. C., ii. 414.
 Storrs, R. H., iii. 267, 270.
 Stoughton, John, ii. 28, 63 f., 85, iii. 185.
 Strachan, John, iii. 344 f.
 Strafford, Earl of, 337, 341, 352.
 Strauss, David, iii. 21 ff., 35.
 Strawbridge, Robert, ii. 270.
 Strong, James, iii. 290.
 Stundists, iii. 378.
 Sully, 198 ff.
 Summerfield, John, iii. 289.
 Summers, T. O., iii. 290.
 Sunday, Puritan view of, 340 f., ii. 283 f.; abolished in the French Revolution, ii. 353.
 Sunderland, La Roy, iii. 241.
 Supremacy, Act of, 273 f., 303 f., ii. 1.
 Sweden, 116 ff., 598 f., iii. 41.
 Swedenborg, Emanuel, ii. 433 ff.
 Swedenborgians, or the New Church, ii. 439 f., iii. 342.
 Swift, Jonathan, 573, 575 f., ii. 113, 123.
 Switzerland, 120 ff., 601 f., ii. 442, iii. 35 ff.
 Syllabus of Errors, iii. 109 ff.
 Syncretists, 584 ff.
- TABERNACLE Connection, ii. 61.
 Taoism, iii. 396 f.
 Taschereau, Cardinal, iii. 314.
 Tauler, John, 54.
 Taylor, Isaac, ii. 34, 48, 63, 87 f., 92.
 Taylor, Jeremy, 346, 348 f., 559 f.
 Taylor, N. W., iii. 262 f.
 Taylor, Rowland, 293.
 Taylor, William, iii. 403.
 Teller, W. A., ii. 394.
 Temperance reform, ii. 91, 285 f., iii. 204 f., 244 ff.
 Temporal Power, of the Pope, 519, ii. 362, iii. 44, 123 ff.
- Ten Articles, the, 276 f.
 Tennent, Gilbert, ii. 258 f.
 Tersteegan, Gerhard, ii. 401.
 Test Act, 304 f., 543, ii. 96, iii. 134.
 Tetzel, John, 57 ff.
 Teutonic Order, its secularization, 95 f.
 Texas, ii. 130, 168.
 Theatre, the, in colonial times, ii. 284.
 Theiner, A., ii. 329, 344, 347, 349, 354, iii. 87.
 Theosophy, 580 f., ii. 354 f., 399, iii. 343.
 Theses, Luther's, 60 ff.
 Thirlwall, Connop, iii. 133, 166.
 Thirty-Nine Articles, 284, 304.
 Thirty Years' War, 436 ff.
 Thoburn, J. M., iii. 393.
 Tholuck, F. A. G., iii. 26.
 Thomasius, Christian, 584, 592.
 Thomasius, G., iii. 28.
 Thomassin, 504.
 Thorn, Disputation of, 586.
 Thorndike, Herbert, 558.
 Tieck, Ludwig, ii. 431.
 Tillemont, 473.
 Tillotson, John, 549, 568 f., ii. 4.
 Tilly, 442, 446 f.
 Tindal, Matthew, ii. 16 f., 20.
 Toland, John, ii. 12.
 Tolstoi, Count, iii. 377.
 Toplady, A. M., ii. 79 f., 87.
 Torgau, the League of, 96.
 Tories, 571.
 Torquemada, 380 f.
 Toulouse, Council of, 366, 368.
 Tozer, Bishop, iii. 403.
 Tractarianism, iii. 133 f., 136 ff., 205 f., 298 f.
 Tracts for the Times, iii. 138 ff.
 Transcendentalism, iii. 253 f., 340.
 Trent, Council of, 101, 359 ff.
 Treves, the "holy coat" at, iii. 63.
 Trevor, G., iii. 149.
 Tulloch, John, ii. 107 f., iii. 160, 201.
 Tweten, A. D. C., iii. 18.
 Tyerman, Luke, ii. 37, 82, iii. 181.
 Tyler, Bennet, iii. 263.
 Tyndale, William, 266 ff., 274.
 Tyrannicide, Jesuit teaching respecting, 426 f.
 Tyrconnel, 546, 553.
- ULLMANN, K., iii. 18, 22.
 Ulster, Plantation of, 352.
 Ultramontanism, 361 f., 392, ii. 322, 365, iii. 64 ff., 202 f.
 Unam Sanctam, the bull, iii. 114 f.

- Uniate Church, 604, iii. 342, 379.
 Uniformity, Act of, 304, 541.
 Unigenitus, the bull, 426, 502 ff., ii. 292 f., 301 f., 318 ff., iii. 417 f.
 Union, the, between Lutherans and Reformed, ii. 388, iii. 7 f.
 Unitarians, in England, ii. 96, 102, 282 f., iii. 185 f.; in America, iii. 247 ff.
 United Brethren; see Moravians.
 United Brethren in Christ, ii. 253, iii. 342 f.
 United Secession Church, ii. 106.
 Universalists, ii. 280 ff., 288 f., iii. 258 ff.
 Urban VIII., 358, 387 f., 486.
 Ursperger, ii. 399.
 Uruguay, iii. 368 f.
 Usher, James, 353 f.
 Utopia of Thomas More, 16.
 Utrecht, Treaty of, ii. 141.
 Uttenbogart, J., 253.
- VALDÉS, Fernando, 227.
 Valdés, Juan, 216.
 Valla, Laurentius, 11, 72.
 Van Hemert, ii. 442.
 Van Oosterzee, J. J., iii. 40.
 Van Prinsterer, Groen, iii. 38.
 Vasey, Thomas, ii. 70, 273.
 Vassy, massacre of, 192.
 Vatican Council, iii. 44, 62 ff., 64 ff., 112 ff.
 Vaudois, 177 f., 511.
 Venema, Hermann, ii. 442.
 Venezuela, iii. 369.
 Venn, Henry, ii. 60, 81, 94.
 Verona, Council of, 366.
 Vestments, dispute over, in England, 283, 311.
 Venillot, iii. 61, 76.
 Viceroy, Spanish, in America, ii. 131 f.
 Victor Emmanuel, iii. 124.
 Vienna, Congress of, ii. 336 f.
 Villegagnon, ii. 135.
 Vilmar, A. F. C., iii. 28.
 Vilmergen War, the, 601.
 Virgin; see Mary.
 Virgin of Guadalupe, ii. 185.
 Virginia, ii. 144, 149, 175, 179, 196 ff., 207.
 Vincent, J. H., iii. 289.
 Vincent de Paul, 465 f.
 Vinet, A., iii. 36 f.
 Viret, Peter, 141.
 Vitringa, Campegius, ii. 442.
- Voltaire, 465, 490, 494, 505 f., 612, ii. 19, 305 ff., 319 f., 385, 445.
- WALDENSES, 177 f., 219, iii. 43.
 Walker of Truro, ii. 94.
 Wallace, A. R., iii. 208 ff.
 Wallace, Robert, ii. 108.
 Wallenstein, 442 f., 447 f.
 Wallis, John, ii. 97.
 Walsh, Thomas, ii. 89.
 Waltersdorf, ii. 401.
 Walther, C. F. W. iii. 305 f.
 Warburton, William, ii. 20.
 Ward, William, iii. 389.
 Ward, W. G., iii. 147.
 Ware, Henry, iii. 248.
 Warren, W. F., iii. 288, 290.
 Wartburg, Luther's sojourn at the, 84 ff.
 Washington, George, ii. 155, 157.
 Watson, Richard, iii. 181.
 Watts, Isaac, ii. 100 f.
 Wegscheider, ii. 414, iii. 8.
 Weigel, Valentine, 580.
 Weinbrenner, John, iii. 279.
 Wellhausen, iii. 34.
 Weniger, iii. 81.
 Wesley, Charles, ii. 36, 42, 46, 48, 62 ff., 77 f.
 Wesley, John, his obligations to William Law, ii. 7 f., 35 f., 40; birth and early education, 34; career at Oxford, 34 ff.; temporary leaning to mysticism, 40 ff.; labors and fortunes in Georgia, 42 ff.; induction into a thoroughly evangelical faith and experience, 44 ff.; out-door preaching, 47 f.; judgment on the physical phenomena of the revival, 49 f.; exposure to mob violence and fierce criticism, 51 ff.; severance from Whitefield on the doctrine of predestination, 58 f.; organization which he gave to his societies, 64 ff.; relation to the Established Church, 69 ff.; steps taken toward a distinct denominational status, 69 ff.; doctrinal teachings, 73 ff.; the occasion which he gave to the Calvinistic controversy, and the manner in which it was carried on, 78 ff.; estimate of his character and work, 85 ff.; his death, 91; his comment on the bad management of religion in Ireland, 117 f.; relations with American Methodism, 269 ff.
- Wesleyan Association, iii. 179.

- Wesleyan Methodist Connection, iii. 241, 284.
 Wesleyans; see Methodists.
 West, Stephen, ii. 179.
 Westminster Assembly, 343 ff., 540.
 Westphalia, Peace of, 5 f., 450 f.
 Wettstein, J. J., ii. 442.
 Whatcoat, Richard, ii. 70, 273.
 Whately, Richard, iii. 133, 166 ff.
 Whedon, D. D., iii. 290.
 Wheelock, Eleazar, ii. 179.
 Whichcote, Benjamin, 560.
 Whigs, 571.
 Whiston, William, ii. 98.
 Whitaker, Alexander, ii. 196.
 White, William, ii. 208 ff.
 Whitefield, George, at Oxford, ii. 37, 46; his initiation of out-door preaching, 47; marvellous gift of sacred oratory, 54 ff., espousal of Calvinism and temporary breach with Wesley, 57 ff.; relation to the organization of Calvinistic Methodism, 59 f.; labors in America, 203, 241 f., 268.
 Whitgift, John, 313 ff.
 Wicherl, J. H., iii. 17.
 Wilberforce, William, ii. 90, 94.
 William I., Emperor of Germany and King of Prussia, iii. 4 f., 15 f.
 William the Silent, Prince of Orange, 238 f., 243, 246, 248 f.
 William of Orange (William III. of England), 513, 553 f., 563 ff., ii. 1, 152, 154.
 William and Mary College, ii. 197.
 Williams, Robert, ii. 270.
 Williams, Roger, ii. 150, 227 ff.
 Williams, William, ii. 61.
 Wilson, Bishop of Calcutta, iii. 145.
 Wilson, Henry, iii. 235, 243.
 Wilson, H. B., iii. 170 f.
 Wilson, John, iii. 392.
 Wimpina, Conrad, 61.
 Winchester, Elhanan, ii. 281 f.
 Windthorst, iii. 12, 17.
 Winslow, Josiah, ii. 174 f.
 Winthrop, John, ii. 225, 285.
 Wise, John, ii. 221.
 Wiseman, Archbishop, iii. 189 f.
 Wishart, George, 320.
 Witchcraft, ii. 29, 108, 236 ff., iii. 363.
 Wittenberg, University of, 50, 590.
 Wolf, Christian, ii. 392 ff.
 Wolf, E. G., iii. 307.
 Wolfenbüttel Fragments, ii. 395.
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 262 f., 270 ff., 277.
 Woolman, John, ii. 287.
 Woolston, ii. 15 f., 20.
 Worcester, Leonard, iii. 248.
 Worcester, Samuel, iii. 249.
 Wordsworth, William, iii. 132.
 World's Parliament of Religions, iii. 409 f.
 Worms, Diet of, in 1495, 36; in 1521, 38, 79 ff.
 Württemberg, iii. 8, 106 f.
 XAVIER, Francis, 395, 402 ff.
 Ximenes, 14.
 YALE College, iii. 227, 229.
 Young, Brigham, iii. 333.
 Young Men's Christian Association, iii. 189.
 ZEISBERGER, David, ii. 180.
 Ziegenbalg, B., iii. 386.
 Zinzendorf, 593 ff., iii. 384.
 Zollikoffer, ii. 394.
 Zumárraga, Bishop, ii. 181 f.
 Zurich Consensus, 166.
 Zwingli, his conference with Luther at Marburg, 97; his view of the foreign service of the Swiss, 121 f.; talents and character as compared with those of Luther, 123 ff.; doctrinal points on which he differed from Luther, 125 ff.; early education, 127; career as a reformer, 128 ff.

Date Due

RECEIVED			
FACULTY			
My 21 '48			
FACULTY			
FACULTY			
FACULTY			
RECEIVED NO 22 '48			
JE 3-49 MY 23 '50			
JE 5 '50			

(B)			

BW901 .S54 v.5
History of the Christian church.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00015 7463